DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 109 RC 008 821

AUTHOR	Olivas, Roberto
TITLE	A National Council of La Raza Report on Impact of Limited Federal Statistical Data/Information on Hispanic Americans.
INSTITUTION	National Council of La Raza, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 74
NOTE	115p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council of La Raza, 1025 15th Street, N.W., Fourth Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005 ($6.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Data Collection; Decision Making; Definitions; *Federal Government; Group Dynamics; Information Systems; *Management Information Systems; Policy Formation; Role Perception; *Socioeconomic Influences; *Spanish Culture; Statistical Data

ABSTRACT

In a technologically advanced society, many of the dialogues take place within the "management information system," or as a result of the "hard data" acquired through such a system, rather than in a public forum. The absence of the Hispanic American from that type of systems dialogue can and does place unnecessary disadvantages on Hispanic Americans in the nation's public affairs. This report focuses on the importance of the management information systems and discusses the extent of confusion surrounding the issue of Hispanic American interests and definitions. Intended to aid in defining the problem of informations systems as they pertain to Hispanic Americans, the report's objectives are to: (1) bring about an increased awareness of the extent of the problem, and (2) provide a better understanding of its implications on the future economic, social, and cultural development of Hispanic Americans. The operations of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) are reviewed. An elaboration of how OMB has used its delegated authority to provide direction to the issue of racial/ethnic data policies is provided. An assessment of three major statistical services systems in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare illustrates the extent of lack of direction provided by OMB on statistical policies. (Author/NQ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

WASHINGTON SCENE REPORT
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA
RAUL YZAGUIRRE, National Director

ED113109

A NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA REPORT

ON

IMPACT OF LIMITED FEDERAL STATISTICAL DATA/INFORMATION POLICIES

ON HISPANIC AMERICANS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared June 1974

by

National Services Section
Roberto Olivas, Director
K. W. May, Research Analyst

NCLR © 1974

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Council of La Raza
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

RC008827

1025 Fifteenth Street, N.W. Fourth Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 659-1251

0002

CONTENTS PAGES

PREFACE . . . . . i - iii

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The National Council of La Raza. . . . . 1 - 3

B. The Challenge: A Domestic Policy on the Hispanic American. . . . 4 - 13

II. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS IN DOMESTIC POLICY

A. Perspective on Information and Technology. . . . . 14 - 27

B. The Enormity of the Federal Information Enterprise. . . . . 28 - 31

C. Policy Oriented Research: Consequences of Biracial Methodology . 32 - 44

D. Who are the Hispanic Americans?

a. Hispanic American Historical Sketch . . . . . 45 - 49

b. Problems of Current Definitions . . . . . 50 - 62

III. FEDERAL AGENCIES: THE CURRENT ROLE OF THE HISPANIC AMERICAN IN INFORMATION SYSTEMS

A. Office of Management and Budget

a. Racial/Ethnic Data Policy. . . . . 63 - 73

b. Social Indicators 1973. . . . . 74 - 80

B. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare . . . . . 81 - 83

a. National Center for Health Statistics . . . . . 84 - 89

b. National Center for Social Statistics . . . . . 90 - 93

c. National Center for Educational Statistics . . . . . 94 - 101

IV. CONCLUSION. . . . . 102 - 108

PREFACE

"Classically and traditionally one should start with definitions," commented HEW Secretary, Casper Weinberger, in his speech, Creativity and Collaboration in Government - The Budget Process (Franklin Nelson Doubleday lectures, May 23, 1974). However, as our study shall illustrate, it is the National Council of La Raza's contention that this very concern for definitions, so carefully structured and articulated by our political institutions and their official spokesmen, serve to obscure instead of clarifying issues.

For too long, the Hispanic American has been buried in the anonymity of statistics and semantics which neither apply to them nor characterize them. In the 50's they were categorized as Spanish surnamed or Spanish speaking; in the 60's new terms entered into vogue as the younger activists popularized "the brown people"or "La Raza,"in an attempt to give higher visibility to the problems of this population. As we enter the decade of the 70's, we bring with us the continuing quest for those identifiers that will establish--for others--who we are. For the Hispanic Americans, irrelevant criteria have been set up which are applicable to only a small segment of their population, if at all, and which is based on foreign rather than their own political and economic realities.

The problem of the Hispanic American issue is not with the terminology - as long as the terms reflect and facilitate the rational, rather than romanticized or non-classical tradition and application. A useful case in point is described by historian Harry Kantor in the

Ideology and Program of the Peruvian Aprista Movement (Washington, D.C., 1966):

> Because of their emphasis upon looking realistically at Latin America, the Apristas spent much energy discussing what name should be given to the area south of the Rio Grande. They look upon this area as a homogeneous entity and they give the name Indoamerica. This name, they say, is truly descriptive of the area, for it takes account of the two parts contained therein: the indigenous, the aboriginal, all that was present before 1492, and the European contribution.

Kantor notes the many and strong objections by the Apristas to the terminology generally used by those north of the Rio Grande to define the Indoamerican. "They (the Apristas) are for the use of Indoamerica."

> The point they emphasize is that the use of this name leads to a clearer understanding of the area. Indoamerica suggests the two component parts of the area, and the use of the term, the Aprista insists, would prevent exclusive concentration upon the needs of the Europeanized section of the population.

A different, yet parallel view is expressed by Mexican philosopher-historian Jose Vasconcelos, who in his La Raza Cosmica - Mision de la Raza Iberomericana (Mexico City, 1966) has sought to focus our attention on the depth of injustices and extent of irrationality flowing from classical and traditional European-dominated definitions and meanings. Poignantly he writes:

> Each race that arises needs to develop its own philosophy, the deus ex machina of its success. We, ourselves, have been educated under the humiliating influence of a philosophy conceptualized by our enemies, which--even though expressed in a righteous manner--exalted its own ends and frustrated ours. From this fate, we, ourselves,

> have come to believe in the inferiority of the Mestizo, in the unredeemability of the Indian, in the condemnation of the Black, in the irreparable decadence of the Oriental.

Vasconcelos and the Aprista movement both reflect the classical and traditional thrust of the Hispanic American community. Our present study draws attention to how political systems have attempted to apply their own definitions to our community. While many others seek to resolve this issue by addressing the semantics and terminology, we hope to illustrate how it is really a matter of political and economic considerations, and how these definitions reflect - within the social statistical systems and the management information systems - the racial and ethnic premises operating within the American social and political structures. This NCLR Report, The Impact of Limited Federal Statistical Data/Information Policies on Hispanic Americans, is, therefore, designed to focus attention on the adverse effect on the Hispanic American created by officially sanctioned, yet traditional European-dominated terminology.

In the classic sense, government has largely failed to deal with the rights, needs and interests of the nation's second largest minority. Until government begins to clearly define the issue of the Hispanic American in rational terms, political assumptions and bias will continue to play the primary and determinative role in policy-and decision-making regarding our community. These are the underlying themes of the report.

Alex Zermeno, Acting Director
National Council of La Raza

I. INTRODUCTION

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA

The National Council of La Raza (NCLR) is a private, non-profit, non-partisan Chicano organization with headquarters office in Washington, D.C., and a program office in Phoenix, Arizona.

As an advocate, this Mexican American Civil Rights organization is a conduit of Chicano positions in the private and public sectors on both programmatic and policy fronts in a variety of areas including housing, economic development, education and health.

NCLR has communicated Chicano concerns and moods to such federal agencies as the Office of Management and Budget, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Revenue Sharing, Small Business Administration and various health services agencies and the Office of Education within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. NCLR also has been invited to testify before various congressional hearings where it has clearly voiced a number of priority Chicano concerns.

Through the NCLR's publication, Agenda, a monthly newsletter and quarterly magazine, we have continually articulated Mexican American issues and concerns. One such concern has been the lack of adequate data gathering and information systems of the Federal Government.

NCLR's concern goes beyond the continuing debate on the inefficiency with which the Bureaus of Census and Labor Statistics address themselves to the needs, interests and rights of the Hispanic American population of our nation. It goes beyond the

immediate benefits that are derived from improved population counts, employment statistics and other social and economic data inherent in these information processing enterprises.

The Council's concern addresses the manner with which our nation and its public leaders conduct public affairs to meet the nation's social and economic interests, including the interests of Hispanic Americans, and, the extent to which national interest is the dominant factor of those who make public policy and decisions.

Recognizing that an essential component of responsible and forthright public affairs or public policy is sound information, the NCLR, therefore, has a vital interest in those national policies that further, or hinder, the production of sound information upon which government and others base policies, make decisions and take other important actions which affect the national interest.

The following is a report on the poor health of this nation's information systems policy in regard to the Hispanic American population, an element of our society which has not been properly identified, and thus, has been excluded from vital data and information gathering processes.

The position of NCLR is that public information is public property, furthermore, that the public has a right to quality information. Public institutions have an obligation to provide sound information, not misinformation; useful information, not statistical atrocities! The public has a right to know the facts and conditions facing our society in order that it may measure how well the nation's policies

are meeting the nation's needs and interests. This holds equally true with regard to the Hispanic American taxpayer and consumer. Both the people and their elected leaders need to have sound information to insure sound management. The absence of a Federal policy for quality information on the Hispanic Americans can, and does, result in de facto exclusionary policies, patterns and practices which work against the Hispanic Americans. Such policies aid and abet the segregation of Hispanic Americans interests from the economic and social policies of public and private institutions.

THe Challenge:

A Domestic Policy on the Hispanic American

Presently our Federal government does not have a policy of advancing the well-being and interests of the more than 10 million Hispanic Americans. National policies which do exist, in the social, economic, political and cultural spheres do not systematically include consideration for the well-being and interests of the nation's second largest minority.

The above judgement is less the result of harsh experience of the evident and long-standing struggle by Hispanic American communities, organizations and leaders for a share of public funds to solve outstanding needs in the barrios. Such judgement is based on the iron logic of the very processes with which government developes and institutes social and economic policies. What is at stake, therefore, is something beyond the equitable allocation and distribution of federal, state and local funds based on the maximum accurate statistical counting of Hispanic Americans--equity and equality of consideration. Ultimately, a policy based on no count is infinitely more damaging than a policy based on undercount. An accurate count of the Hispanic American does not by itself lead to improvements in national policies - it merely indicates that the problems may be larger than have previously been recognized. The real problem is now the public institutions can be made to efficiently and effectively begin to manage the public's affairs in a manner that ensures the inclusion of Hispanic American interests.

Management has been recognized as the basic problem and is so noted in The United States Budget - Fiscal Year 1975 prepared by the Office of Management and Budget of the Executive Office of the President. A fundamental element to an understanding of the present Administration's domestic policies is found in its focus on improving the management of public affairs:

> The recommendations contained in the budget are part of a broad effort by the Administration, working with Congress and with State and local officials, to improve the workings of government on all levels. The New Federalism is a crucial element of this broad endeavour. A second, complimentary element consists of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal programs in carrying out Federal responsibilities.[1]

Only indirectly or occasionally, however, do the documents of the Budget define what is entailed in improving the workings of government on all levels and improving efficiency and effectiveness.

Sound management is based on sound policies which, in the case of government, are in large measure defined by the fundamental laws and constitutional processes of the nation. Sound policies are based on sound interpretation of the laws and on information about the facts and conditions to which the interpretation is applied. Interpretations are based on sound management and its interplay with each of the other branches of government - executive, legislative and judicial. Information is the basis for sound management. However, one cannot manage the facts in the sense that facts and conditions can be changed through negotiations and "pragmatic" compromises of data and statistics. This, unfortunately, is the very problem confronting Hispanic Americans.

---

[1] The United States Budget in Brief - Fiscal Year 1975. Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget. n.d. (February 4, 1974), p. 9.

Facts about, and conditions of, the Hispanic Americans are hidden in the information, data and statistics used by government for making public policy and for managing public affairs.* Even when useable information on the Hispanic American is available or accessable, the interests and needs of Hispanic Americans are not systematically identified and accurately defined by or within the government's information systems.

For statistical purposes, the Hispanic American is generally included within the white population categories. Yet for policy-making purposes - particularly when considering the allocation and distribution of resources - the Hispanic American usually is included in a minority classification or is not included at all. The factual condition of the nation's information systems is such, that in making national policies, only Black and white interests are defined statistically. To the extent that national policies are so defined, the existing management of public affairs can but systematically reflect these interests and not those of the Hispanic or other Americans.

The clearest illustration of the above management problem is to be found in the Office of Management and Budget itself. Thus, we note, for instance, that the Office of Management and the Budget has developed a set of social indicators upon which the needs of this country are to be assessed. It is precisely this

---

*For insight on this, see "Accuracy of 1970 Census Population and Housing Characteristics as Measured by Re-interviews," in Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section - 1973, American Statistical Association, by Charles Jones, et al. pp. 145-146; and Consistency of Reporting of Ethnic Origin in the Current Population Survey, Technical Paper 31, Bureau of the Census, February 1974, by Charles E. Johnson, Jr.

kind of information which is used for purposes of legislation and allocation. Yet its report, titled Social Indicators 1973, has no reference to the Hispanic Americans of this country. We can only assume that the Hispanic Americans will not be an identifiable group which will receive the benefit of future social planning and resources. This condition of non-existence in data used for policy-making exists throughout the Federal management information systems. Thus data released from the Census Bureau, labor statistics and other recognized population measures either do not include or do not adequately portray the Hispanic American as an identifiable ethnic group. Such data, therefore, is rendered useless in attempting to plan the social needs of a population which historically and literally has not been counted. Neither the current premises of the information systems nor the processes for using the information allow for the systematic consideration of interests of the Hispanic American. It is because of this lack of data that the Hispanic American community has been forced to deal in a political climate that smacks of the old patron system and forced to return to the worn out rhetoric of the past in dramatizing the needs of its people.

That our Federal government does not have a policy of advancing the well-being and interests of the Hispanic American is apparent from the existence of the biracial information systems in the Federal agencies - from the Domestic Council, Council of Economic Advisors and Office of Management and Budget on downward to such important agencies as the National Centers for Health, Social, and Educational Statistics as well as the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The existence of these biracial information systems reveals a blatant misuse and misunderstanding of the facts and conditions of this nation. Further, it indicates the systematic non-utilization of available and accessable data on the Hispanic American and a policy that allows for the underutilization of information systems when the issue of the Hispanic American is raised. Whatever the case may be, the interests and needs of the Hispanic American are excluded.

This condition is by no means confined to the Federal policy-makers. The biracial approach to problem solving also prevails in the private sector. Thus, for example, the National Urban League, by its charter mandated to enhance opportunities for minorities, prepared a study on the relationship between the Census undercount and general revenue sharing funds under the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972. The report, Estimating The 1970 Census Undercount For State and Local Areas, made public during July 1973, pointedly notes:

> The National Urban League's 1970 Census Project experience revealed, for example, that the undercount rates for persons of Spanish descent were probably much larger than those for blacks. Yet our method, which is based on the Census Bureau's estimates, fails to explicitly take account of the undercount among Spanish-speaking groups.[2]

The outcome of the study is that only Black and white interests become statistically defined, although the same areas found by the

---

[2] Urban League Data Services, Estimating The 1970 Census Undercount For State And Local Areas, Presented at the Annual Conference of the National Urban League on July 23, 1973 in Washington, D.C., p. 5.

Urban League to have the highest number of undercounts, are also the areas with the highest Hispanic American population.

Although the Urban League specifically notes that the non-white population excludes "certain Spanish-speaking groups, like the Chicanos, (who) are often referred to as 'browns'," and that "a disproportionate number of persons of Spanish ancestry classified themselves as 'other races' on the 1970 Census forms" other private sector policy-oriented research groups are less cautious in their definitions of minorities and non-whites.[3] Whether included in such definitions, or not, the interests of Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and the other Hispanic American groups are not defined. Facts about, and conditions of, the Hispanic Americans remain hidden in the information, thus the resulting management policies and decisions reflect facts and conditions which have little or no relationship to the Hispanic American constituencies of the United States.

With the advent of modern management information systems through computer technology and statistical and systems analysis, the question of how such technological innovations will be used to enhance, or hinder, the development of Hispanic Americans, has been posed on a more frequent basis of leaders in our many communities. Considerable concern has mounted in Hispanic American sectors and communities regarding our society's seeming inability to channel these technological developments in directions that (1) respect the broad range of human needs, and (2) specifically aid in

---

[3] Op. cit., p. 5. See also Chapter II, of the present National Council of La Raza Statement.

advancing the development of Hispanic Americans and their Barrios. The belief is now widely held that the continuation of certain technological trends and those policies that guide the utilization of technology - particularly through management information systems - provide enormous advantages to some sectors, but pose grave dangers to the various minority groups, particularly the Hispanic Americans. With few exceptions, the central question asked of management information systems is what they would do, or are doing, to the economic and institutional interests of those who are deciding whether or how to exploit these systems, rather than what they would also do, or are doing to the economic and institutional interests of all those public sectors who are affected by such systems. In that regard, none of the statistical services agencies have ever undertaken, or published, an analysis of their impact on policy-making and management of public affairs and how this affects Hispanic Americans.

Although it is recognized that the Federal government cannot do everything and that money alone will not solve all of this nation's problems, it is also recognized that government has certain obligations to <u>all</u> sectors and communities of this nation - including those of the Hispanic Americans. These obligations are the consequences of our rights as Americans and as human beings, as well as the desirability and wisdom of responding to the needs of our

- communities. Above all, however, in terms of what government represents today as a management information system encompassing the whole nation, the obligations are the consequences of the need for sound planning for the national interest and the national welfare. The systematic exclusion of, or limitations on, the interests of the more than 10 million people who happen to be Hispanic Americans, is not sound national interest policy. Such a policy undermines the natural development of both Hispanic Americans and the Nation - economically, socially, politically and culturally.

The effect of poor planning and lack of research data are most apparent in the current allocation of social program resources, as evidenced by the distribution of revenue sharing funds and the damaging effects on Hispanic American programs. The examples of neglect are blatant, but they merely reflect the absence of a sound policy on the Hispanic American by our government. The absence of such a policy can only result in inefficiency and ineffectiveness by management on all levels, federal state and local.

What is clearly necessary is an examination of the important role played today by information systems at the highest levels of government, particularly within the Domestic Council and the Office of Management and Budget. Such an examination needs to faciliate the establishment of a national policy posture which recognizes and systematically includes the consideration of the rights and interests of the Hispanic Americans who are statistically

defined. This national policy posture needs to have a multi-racial and ethnic perspective and a multi-cultural perspective which abandons the biracial (black/white) and mono-cultural perspectives which presently prevail at the policy levels. Within such a policy posture, the improvement of the accuracy of data and information on the Hispanic American can then be more readily enhanced, and, the appropriate procedures for the inclusion of the Hispanic American in data used for policy-making and decision-making by management can take place.

This brief report focuses on the importance of the management information systems, shows how past warnings have been generally disregarded in the area of social indicators and reveals the extent of confusion surrounding the issue of Hispanic American interests and definitions.

It then reviews the operations of the Office of Management and Budget and elaborates on how it has used its delegated authority to provide direction to the issue of racial/ethnic data policies.

An assessment of three major statistical services systems in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare provides a further illustration of the extent of lack of direction privided by OMB on statistical policies. It offers an understanding or appreciation of the concerns voiced about the exclusion of Hispanic American interests in the basic social services in which the Federal government plays a major role in terms of research, direction and finance.

II. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS IN DOMESTIC POLICY

Perspective On
Information And Technology

The significance of information systems is underscored by the increasing reliance placed upon them as technical and management tools for policy-making, planning, budgeting and evaluation purposes by government on all levels. The trend toward such reliance has increased over the past few years and stands to further increase with regionalization, decentralization and revenue sharing thrusts. These are accompanied by advanced management techniques - management information systems and management by objectives approaches - which have increasingly become part of the normal operations of governmental institutions. Statistics and data gathering are key components of the advances in information technology and management technology. Economic and social statistics form the basis of information systems through which management makes economic and social policies and decisions. Thus, accurate data and information are vital political tools in the efficient and just advancement of social and economic interests.

In 1969, a Panel on Technological Assessment of the National Academy of Sciences addressed itself to some of the implications of technological development in a report requested by Congress. It noted that "in recent years concern has mounted over society's seeming inability to channel technological developments in directions that sufficiently respect the broad range of human needs."[4]

---

[4] Technology: Processes of Assessment and Choice. Report of the National Academy of Sciences. Committee on Science and Astronautics, U. S. House of Representatives. July 1969, p. 1. (The Panel was chaired by Dr. Harvey Brooks from Harvard University, who was also chairman of the Academy's Committee on Science and Public Policy.)

Of particular concern to the Panel was the following:

> As they consider the possibility of exploiting or opposing a technological opportunity or development, individuals, corporations, and public institutions attempt to project the gains and losses to themselves of alternative courses of actions, and seek a course designed to maximize gains while minimizing the losses. The difficulty is that self-interest analysis of this sort may ignore important implications of particular choices for sectors of society other than those represented in the initial decisions. In their pursuit of benefits for themselves or for the particular public they serve, those who make the relevant decision may fail to exploit technological opportunities that, from a broader perspective, might clearly deserve exploitation. Likewise, as they seek to minimize costs to themselves, the same decision-makers may pursue technological paths that, from a broader perspective, ought to be redirected so as to reduce undesirable consequences for others.[5]

This ad hoc Panel of the Academy's Committee on Science and Public Policy repeatedly stressed the above concerns:

> ...the very essence of the panel's concern about the narrowness of the criteria that currently dominate technological choices is a conviction that the present system fails to give all affected interests effective representation in the crucial processes of decision.[6]

The Panel specifically "...warned against the loose assumptions that have generally characterized discussion of our problem - the assumption, for example, that one can speak intelligibly and unambiguously about maximizing aggregate welfare..."[7]

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 9-10.

[6] Ibid., p. 30.

[7] Ibid., p. 39.

Only three months after the release of this National Academy of Science report, the President announced the formation of a Task Force on Science Policy. Chaired by Dr. Ruben F. Mettler, President of TRW, Inc., the Task Force reported on the Federal Government's science policy in its April 1970 Science and Technology: Tools For Progress. The Report noted that:

> Our national progress will become ever more critically dependent upon the excellence of our science and technology. A vigorous, high-quality program aimed at advancing our scientific and technological capabilities (including the social, economic, and behavioural components) is vital to all national goals and purposes. Such a program is especially vital to ... the health of business, labor, and the professions; to the quality of our environment; to the personal health and welfare of all; to the scope and quality of our educational processes; and to the culture, spirit, and inspiration of our people generally. The effectiveness of essentially all our social institutions, including particularly Government itself, is deeply influenced by the quality of our science and technology. The Nation, therefore, has a fundamental need for excellence in science and technology.[8]

The President's Task Force on Science Policy specifically rejected a course of action in which technology would dictate social purpose - "On the contrary, we wish to emphasize the importance of seeking to optimize utilization of science and technology in the service of social, political, and economic goals." [9]

With respect to the defining of goals for the national science policy, the Task Force report noted:

---

[8] Science and Technology: Tools for Progress. The Report of the President's Task Force on Science Policy. April 1970 (December 10, 1969), p. 8.

[9] Ibid.

> The central crisis is one of management, of leadership, of inspiration, with an eye to the future as well as the present. Generalized goals must be broken down into specific sub-elements and specific realistic milestones established; specific responsibilities must be assigned with clear-cut processes of review, specific attainable criteria and standards with quantitative as well as qualitative substance must be promulgated; and all of these should be projected over suitable periods of time (e.g., ten to twenty years), with specific machinery for review and reprojection. Such long-range national programs should, of course, have the benefit of searching Congressional debate and formal legislative approval as appropriate. Frequently heard reasons why ten- or fifteen-year national programs cannot be established (e.g., the yearly budget cycle, the short-term nature of legislative and executive terms, the unwillingness to commit future administrations) are not convincing.[10]

The report adds that:

> ...it is the view of the Task Force that a special effort is needed to make fuller use of the tools of science and technology in quantitatively projecting long-range requirements associated with our many pressing social, urban, and environmental problems.[11]

The special contribution which science and technology can make, according to the Task Force, is in the area of defining the long-range goals, and in solving the central management problems inherent in broad long-range programs:

> Detailed quantitative development of qualitative goals - which engineers and scientists are especially equipped to do - can aid in choosing wisely among alternatives. It can also help define the subelements of a particular program with sufficient clarity to permit each of the widely dispersed elements in our society to grasp its part, and to assist in reviewing and reprojecting the program needed.[12]

---

[10] Ibid., p. 10

[11] Ibid., p. 11

[12] Ibid.

Among the specific suggestions relating to the above, made by the Task Force on Science Policy, are:

> Provision of substantial financial and intellectual support for efforts now underway to develop a system of social indicators -
>
> Investigation of the procedural and technical problems involved in the devising a national data system for scientific purposes, designed to provide useful data while still protecting individual and institutional privacy -
>
> Wide participation by industry, labor, and the professions generally in the special social problem research groups ...[13]

Repeatedly emphasized as a major challenge to science policy of the Federal government is the incorporation of the social and behavioural sciences into the role of contributor to social and economic solutions. Similarily, heavy stress is laid on long-range projections and plans for a broad-scale attack on social, urban and environmental problems. Such projections and plans, the Task Force recommends, "should include sufficient quantitative detail, including costs and schedules of results to be achieved by particular points in time, to permit integrated review for adequacy and consistency."[14]

At least four major points are advocated in Science and Technology: Tools For Progress:

1) The report asserts the role of engineers and scientists in social and environmental policy-making, particularily in the urban problems context;

---

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid., pp. 4 and 22

2) The recommendations stress the need for long-range planning within the context of a clearly delineated management by objectives approach;

3) The management approach is to involve a partnership of interest groups, including government, business, organized labor and the professions;

4) The policy-making machinery created will need a data system for scientific purposes, and, a system of social indicators through which advances can be measured and goals can be set.

Absent from the above report is the emphasis on caution in policy-making enunciated in the Panel on Technological Assessment of the National Academy of Sciences, including the role of affected interests not represented in crucial processes of planning and policy-making. Though tools of science and technology are intended to enhance the well-being of all within the urban context, and suitable quantitative instruments are to be developed toward attaining that end, no attention is given to the role played by the subelements of society beyond that role assigned to them by the managers and the plans.

Within a year after the presentation of the two Reports by the Panel on Technological Assessments and the Task Force on Science Policy, Daniel Bell - then Chairman of the Academy of Arts

and Sciences' Commission of the Year 2000 - made the following remarks as moderator of a congressionally organized panel that addressed itself to the issue of management of information and knowledge:

> A postindustrial society is organized around information and utilization of information in complex systems, and the use of that information as a way of guiding the society. Without the organization of information, we can no longer know where we are going to be going, and as an old Talmudic aphorism puts it, "If you don't know where you are going, any road will take you there." There is another and even more important fact about a post-industrial society. It is not just a service society in terms of where people work. It is not just an information society on the basis of organizing the flow of knowledge. It is also society uniquely dependent upon the compilation of theoretical knowledge. Now every society has always been dependent on knowledge in order to grow. But it is only in the last decades that we have become uniquely dependent on the codification of theoretical knowledge in order to know where we are. [15]

The role of information and information systems, within the context described by Congressional Panel on Science and Technology, the Academy of Sciences' Panel on Technology Assessment and the President's Task Force on Science Policy can but raise basic questions about the role various minority groups will have in the postindustrial world and the benefits they derive

---

[15] The Management of Information and Knowledge - A Compilation of Papers Prepared for the Eleventh Meeting of the Panel on Science and Technology. Committee on Science and Astronautics, U. S. House of Representatives, 1970., p. 14.

as a consequence of its advances. Whatever the role, it is clear that such groups must find, or build, the best possible road for themselves. It is also clear that the extent to which this can be attained depends very much on the quantity and quality of the information readily available and accessable to all minority communities for social, economic and other developmental activities. The organization of information into "management information systems"- representing a fusion between management science, computer technology, and statistical data collection and processing - by the Federal government, as well as other public and private sectors, is of vital interest to the Hispanic American, as is the issue of "social indicators" repeatedly noted within the scientific and management circles of the highest levels of public and private sectors.

The importance of population statistics and research has been repeatedly noted by the commission on Population Growth and the American Future, chaired by John D. Rockefeller III. In its March 27, 1972 Report to the President and Congress, Population and the American Future, it stated:

> A nation must observe the changes in the number and distribution of its population, evaluate these changes, attempt to affect them in ways that will be useful, measure the impact of steps taken, and adapt and redefine the issues to fit the course of the future that it seeks.

> Viewed in this fashion, a policy program represents a course of conduct that requires a continuing feedback of information and appraisal to produce an intelligent and responsive program as experience grows. Statistics provide the descriptive element of the universe of policy concerns; research provides the analytical insight into causal relationships and consequences of the phenomena that statistics reveal and measure. Both statistics and research must underline the formulation of policy and the design and evaluation of programs.
>
> Public policy in regard to population cannot be intelligently conducted in the absence of timely statistics of high quality on a broad range of subjects. This Commission has received excellent cooperation from federal statistics agencies, but all too often what they could offer was inadequate to the task.[16]

In its chapter on "Population Statistics and Research"the above Commission made numerous recommendations, general as well as specific, relating to"the enrichment of our knowledge on the social and economic side of demographic questions", including the desirability and neccessity of information on the various ethnic subgroups of the nation.

A somewhat similar note was struck earlier in the 1969 Report of the Panel on Social Indicators that had been formed by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, in 1966. This distinguished group of social scientists on the panel included James Coleman, William Gorham (of the Urban Institute),

---

[16] Population and the American Future. The Report of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. March 27, 1972., p. 129.

Karl Kaysen (The Institute for Advanced Study), Samuel Lubell, Daniel Moynihan, Selma Mushkin, Harvey Perloff (Resources for the Future), and numerous other leading social scientists. The Panel's study, Toward a Social Report, makes the following observations:

> Only a fraction of the existing statistics tell us anything about social conditions, and those that do often point in different directions. Sometimes they do not add up to any meaningfull conclusion and thus are not very useful to either the policymaker or the concerned citizen...

A major concern of the Panel was that "the lack of particular types of statistical information stands in the way of better policy choices." Later, the study notes:

> We need to encourage the collection of new and more socially relevant data. If a balanced, organized, and concise set of measures of the condition of our society were available, we should have the information needed to identify emerging problems and to make knowledgeable decisions about national priorities. [17]

Toward a Social Report briefly noted a specific concern relative to minorities:

> We have often spoken of the condition of the Negro Americans, but have not had the data needed to report on Hispanic Americans, American Indians or other ethnic minorities.
>
> If the Nation is to be able to do better social reporting in the future, and do justice to all of the problems that have not been treated here, it will need a wide variety of information that is not available now. It will need not only statistics on additional aspects of the condition of the Nation as a whole, but also information on different groups of Americans. It will need more data on the aged, on youth, and on women, as well as on ethnic minorities. It will need

---

[17] Toward a Social Report, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. January 11, 1969., pp. 95, 96, 100, and 101.

> information not only on objective conditions, but also on how different groups of Americans perceive the conditions in which they find themselves. [18]

The issue of social indicators is closely related to the issue of productivity, and, in many ways, deals with the same concerns expressed by the panels and commissions quoted earlier in the report. The concern for productivity has led to the establishment of the National Commission on Productivity in June of 1970, and, the holding of conferences, such as the National Science Foundation sponsored Colloquium on the Relationship of Research and Development and Economic Growth/Productivity, in April of 1971 at the request of the Office of Management and Budget.

In the Proceedings of the above Colloquium, Leonard Lederman of the National Science Foundation Office of Economic and Manpower Studies noted that "all available evidence indicates that Research and Development is an important contributor to economic growth and productivity. The contribution of Research and Development to economic growth is positive, significant, and high."[19] While primarily concerned with the impact of technological innovation, the Proceedings of that conference indicated an acute awareness of the impact of technology and technological needs on the labor force, on education, the delivery of quality services - especially in

---

[18] Ibid., p. xiv.

[19] Research and Development and Economic Growth/Productivity: Papers and Proceedings of a Colloquium. National Science Foundation. December 1971., p. 3.

health care - on transportation, pollution control, housing, and other areas, as well as the economy of the nation in general. In the discussions, Lederman stated that "Research and Development, it can be argued, is a classical case of political theory of government doing those kinds of things that are economically and socially high in returns for society."[20]

What is significant about much of the current activity in assessing the importance of productivity research and development is the continued absence of any consideration of the relationship of research and development impacts on the different minority subgroups in America. The issue of high return for society naturally raises one question: Is the equitable share of these returns to be merely for certain fractions or groups in that society? The participants of the Colloquium, according to published proceedings, did not broach the question of any return for the various minorities although a need for increased civil research and development efforts was repeatedly stressed.

The same questions can be raised about the work of the National Commission on Productivity, composed of major labor, farm business, and local, State and federal officials. Although the Commission deals extensively with such matters as, the implications of changing labor force participation rates, development of leisure and living standards, the shift to services, environmental concerns, productivity in health care and food services, and measuring the

---

[20] Ibid., p. 66.

productivity of industry, Labor, and local government services, little if any significant consideration has been documented to the bearing all this has on minorities, and particularly Hispanic American communities. All of its work involves extensive acquisition of new tools for measuring "inputs" and "outputs" in industry, and in the public services areas. It is not clear, however, if and how the interests of the different minorities will be taken into account in these productivity measurements, or whether these new tools of measuring, and the evolving policies for improving economic productivity will have a positive social and economic effect on Hispanic American groups and their communities?

The Productivity Commission does have a policy which declares that "A society that seeks the benefits of productivity growth is obligated to safeguard those who would otherwise suffer from its adverse effects."[21] Yet nowhere in this or other of its published reports, have safeguards been instituted for the equal protection of the rights and interests of the Hispanic American worker, consumer and taxpayer.

Thus, within the context of social indicators and productivity measurement, the National Council of La Raza firmly believes that only by a thorough re-evaluation, improvement and expansion of information systems will our society begin to insure that an equitable rate of return becomes a real possibility for

---

[21] Peter G. Peterson, "Statement by the Chairman", Second Annual Report (1972) of the National Commission on Productivity, p. xx.

the Hispanic American population in this country. The current absence of accurate information to allow the public to measure social and economic policies and programs on the national, regional, state and local levels virtually guarantees inequities for certain affected parties (to use a term that the Productivity Commission appears to apply solely to industry, farms, labor and the governmental sectors).

The Enormity of the Federal Information Enterprise

The Federal information systems enterprise engulfs thousands of agencies. Virtually every program and every grant agency has a research, planning and evaluation component.* The 1972-Federal Statistics Directory, 23rd Edition, published by OMB in December of 1972 listed some 500 statistical information services agencies in the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and Treasury. A quick review of the Directory yields the following information on the number of such services per department - although it should be added that federal reorganization activities may have resulted in considerable changes since its publication.

The number breakdown below is therefore an approximation:

AGENCY	NUMBER OF STATISTICAL SERVICES SUB-AGENCIES
Department of Agriculture	86
Department of Commerce	138
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	190 (119 in Health areas and 59 in Welfare areas)
Department of Labor	78
Department of Treasury	31 (approximately 20 in human resources information systems)

* See 1971 Report of Statistical Activities of the Federal Government. Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, Committee on Post Office and Civil Services, House of Representatives, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, March 16, 1972; and Federal Statistics. Report of the President's Commission on Federal Statistics, 1971.

As noted by Julius Shiskin, Chief Statistician of OMB, in his Foreward to the Directory, "...the primary emphasis is on headquarters operations in Washington." Regional offices and many intra-agency branches are not included. The Departments of Agriculture, Bureau of Census, and Bureau of Labor Statistics constitute only a small segment of the total information enterprise of the federal government. As the Foreword to the Directory points out: "..the responsibility for coordination of this activity is placed in the Office of Management and Budget by Section 103 of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950." OMB has both the legislative authority and the responsibility to insure that optimal performance flows from such coordination.

Despite OMB's mandated role, only the most cursory statistical research on the Hispano population of the United States is evident. The handful of reports which do exist, come from the Bureau of Census. There are no in-depth and on-going federal analyses of this nation's invisible Hispanic population.[22]

It would be folly to suggest that among the brain trust and intellectuals influencing the previously mentioned 500 systems agencies, and within that, the thousands of other federal offices, the talent and capability to produce sound data and information on

---

[22]There are exceptions: The so-called "Mayeske Reports" (1972-73), for example, named after Dr. George W. Mayeske, U.S.O.E., Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, contain extensive data on Chicanos and Puerto Ricans. (See comments later on Education).

Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, do not exist. Thus, one can only wonder why the products (the reports, studies, analysis and statistical indicators) existing for the general population, and in many cases only identifying the Black population of our country, do not exist for the more than 10 million Hispanic Americans.

If our nation's information systems were merely make-work programs of no consequence but to idle intellectuals and egg-headed speculators, the questions that are raised would be of no consequence. The issue, however, is of a more serious nature. The issue involves questions of policy formulation and evaluation, the measurement of cost effective approaches, and, reduction of waste in federal funds. But above all, it involves a better understanding of what America is in social and economic terms. In this context, the non-existence of the Hispanic American in the information systems prevents an understanding of a large sector of the population and the solutions to meet outstanding interests and needs.

For statistical or policy purposes, Hispanic Americans do not presently exist in most agencies of the government. The development of an accurate statistical existence in the Bureau of Labor Statistics which can be and will be used in policy formulation and program evaluations, for instance, is of apparent, albeit only very limited value. The question that needs to be answered is, why such a statistical existence of the Hispanic should not be represented across the board in all federal agencies? As evidenced by the thousands of federal research and planning agencies and branches,

outside of BLS, the Census Bureau, and USDA, the nation's policy needs go far beyond the employment data of BLS, accurate census data, and data on rural Americans.

Clearly, the problem is something more than unemployment indicators, census undercounts, foodstamps and the like. There are, after all, more than 40 statistical services offices in the Census and Labor Statistics bureaus and more than 80 in the Department of Agriculture.

POLICY ORIENTED RESEARCH: Consequences of Biracial Methodologies

In his study of Think Tanks, (New York, 1971), Washington-based writer, Paul Dixon, has illustrated that, "In the last decade $150 billion has been spent on...basic research...applied research... and development...commonly referred to as R&D...giving weight to the traditional assertion that Washington's biggest export is paper, all these reports, studies, and surveys resulting from federal research... Such R&D activity created a policy-making framework with far reaching implications. However, with the possible exception of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's Mexican-American Education Project, there were no other major or basic and applied research activities during the decade sponsored by the Federal Government focusing on the Hispanic Americans. Nor can one point to any major basic research activity, either in the public or private sector which directly addresses that particular population. In brief, $150 billion worth of research for the advancement of knowledge, has failed to bring forth any significant data or information relevant to the Hispanic American in this country.

A review of the research activities and publications of major research and development operations in the country reflects a decided neglect of data and information which would aid in planning and decision making guides for this nation's policy-makers with regard to the Hispanic American population. Illustrations of such neglect are found in the leading policy-research oriented operations and products of the better known research institutes such as the Brookings Institution, The Urban Institute, Resources for the Future and the Upjohn Institute. Similarily, the Hispanic American absence prevails in

research and publications sponsored by the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology, numerous government commissions - e.g. National Commission of the Financing of Postsecondary Education, President's Commission on School Finance, National Commission on Productivity, Commission on Population Growth and the American Future and other public and semi-public institutions. These examples clearly indicate the enormity of the knowledge gap of Hispanic American data facing policy-makers and the general public.

Perhaps one of the most recent examples of a suggested policy posture, which has systematically excluded consideration of Hispanic-Americans, is the June, 1973 Report of the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee. The Report, Youth: Transition to Adulthood, is based on data and information that does not differentiate among the various subgroups of the nation, even though Panel Chairman, James Coleman, and various other well-known social scientists, including Norman B. Ryder of the Office of Population Research Princeton University, served on the Panel. The entire perspective of this acclaimed 200-page document is irrelevant to minority ethnic groups, since neither multi-ethnic, nor related class (economic) differentials exist in this report.

As a result, this study on youth raises questions about the absence of consideration for some 6 million children and youth of Hispanic American origin. This, in turn, challenges the validity of the conclusions, premises, methodology, recommendations, and commitment to accuracy or facts as presented by that Panel.

The Youth Report is only one of the numerous widely read and acclaimed studies produced over the past decade under Federal government auspices using the advice of leading private sociologists, political scientists and public affairs experts. Other recent major illustrations of the neglect of Hispanic-Americans is found in the widely acclaimed HEW report on blue-collar worker alienation, Work in America, and the widely disseminated Final Report of the President's Commission of School Finance, Schools, People, and Money: The Need for Education Reform (March 3, 1972). In both cases, noted professionals of high caliber were called upon to help bring national focus to vital policy issues and concerns.

Although these reports indicate an awareness of the issue of social and economic injustice, discrimination and disadvantage, careful analysis, however, bears out the contention that the basis for formulating recommended courses of action do not include the interests of the various and different minority groups.

The issue above is definitely not a matter of, "Counting the Forgotten" Hispanic-American, as suggested by a recent U.S. Civil Rights Commission Report bearing that title. Educational statistics on Hispanic-Americans exist and are accessible. Further, if data or information was not made available, the question of its lack of availability should very well have been raised, and, recommendations addressing this matter might have justifiably been included. This did not occur. What exists in terms of comments by public leaders on the significance of the Hispanic-American question is largely

confined to isolated comments by a very few commissions created by government, an equally small number of isolated private scholars, a number of Congressional representatives, or leaders and spokesmen of the various Hispanic-American communities.

The issue is no longer, if indeed it ever was, a matter of "simple ignorance" or lack of "available data" on the part of government. It is quite difficult to ignore Hispanic-American interests and desires for inclusion in national productivity advancements, on the premise that "we in government simply do not have any accurate data and, therefore, cannot include considerations for your legitimate concerns." Neither the black nor the white population of this country could be accounted for, if that contention were the real premise. There are many acknowledged information gaps and inaccuracies in these sectors! Such gaps or inaccuracies have not prevented the nation's social scientists, demographers and others from extensively studying and developing policies which relate to white and black social sectors, as indicated by a review of Rand, OMB, BLS and Urban Institute publications. Further, in each case there is an awareness of the existence of other racial groups. Indeed, in some cases - such as the HEW Panel on the Social Report and the National Commission on Population Growth - specific note was taken of the existence of various groups, and the need to systematically address their concerns.

Considerable research has been undertaken relative to the nation's black minority, and, the result of such research has been used to educate, inform, sensitize the public, and, to assist in the deliberations of the courts, legislative bodies and

executive branches at the state, local and federal levels. A good illustration of this is to be found in activities by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission; during the U.S. Supreme Court deliberations on Brown vs. Board of Education; and in the U.S. Office of Education's Coleman Report.

Virtually all of the previous mentioned private institutes, and many others, have claimed to foster research on "minorities." Many have received substantial funds for conducting such research. A closer look at their products, however, reveals a consistent definition of the interests of minorities and non-whites in terms of the black population. Similarily, the study of the "poor" or disadvantaged has been consistently posed in terms of black and white by such institutions. The same is the case with regard to the study of "race". Only occasionally are non-black minorities identified and their characteristics noted - generally with the superficiality that defies utilization for policy-making purposes. One example of this is found in the series of Studies on the Governance of Metropolitan Regions, edited by Lowdon Wingo of Resources for the Future, Inc., and in Minority Perspectives (1972) by Dale Rogers Marshall et al. This Paper's only"minority perspective" is that of the black minority. Although one chapter deals with "the attitudes of minorities" and explicitly notes that "unfortunately, evidence on attitudes of Mexican-Americans, Indians, and Puerto Ricans is almost non-existent", the term "minorities" continues to be used - in the words of the author - "to emphasize

the need to find out more about other minorities' views of metropolitan reform." The article then makes clear that "this discussion focuses on blacks", yet also continues to insist that this sufficiently encompasses the perspectives of "the minorities."[23]

The misuse of the term "minority" by scholars is found in other areas as well. The most advanced form of research on the race and minority issue by leading institutes and universities still yields little more than a one-sentence mention of specific subgroups, or the term "Negroes and others," with the implied definition that "others" includes Chicanos, Boricuas, Native Americans.

The December, 1973 Report of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, titled Financing Post-secondary Education in the United States, commits similar errors, but develops its own solution to the problem, such as, "Whites and other Caucasians (which includes Mexican-Americans)", and fails to even note the existence of the other Hispanic-Americans. (See p. 144 of above Report.) The Hispanic inclusion within the "other Caucasian" category, of course, makes any statistical projections and assumptions about white enrollment, white student aid needs, and the like, wholly inaccurate; and makes inaccurate any comparisons between and among whites and non-whites by this Commission.

---

[23] Dale Rogers Marshall, "Metropolitan Government: Views of Minorites," in Minority Perspectives, edited by Lowdon Wingo. Baltimore, The John Hopkins Press, 1972, pp. 13-14.

In its report on Estimating the 1970 Census Undercount for State and Local Areas, the National Urban League Data Service is confronted by a similar problem. The report, presented at the Annual Conference of the National Urban League on July 23, 1973, notes that on April 25, 1973 the U.S. Census Bureau assessed the size of the undercount in the 1970 Census to be 5.3 million persons, or 2.5 percent of the U.S. population. Of these, the Census "estimated that 1.88 million blacks were missed in 1970", an undercount rate of 7.7 percent. "3.45 million white persons were said to have been missed in the 1970 Census." The League's Data Service report further states:

> The method used by the Census Bureau to derive its estimates of the undercount is based on a technique of developing the estimated U.S. population independent of the Census, and then comparing the Census counts to the expected numbers. But the estimated population is developed by using national data on births, deaths, medicare enrollment, immigration - emigration, past census data and analysis of age-sex-race distributions. Since reliable statistics on births, deaths and net immigration cannot be compiled from current records, the Bureau indicated that it could not prepare reliable national undercount estimates for persons of Spanish ancestry....
> Experience revealed, for example, that the undercount rates for persons of Spanish descent were probably much larger than those for blacks. Yet our method, which is based on the Census Bureau's national estimates, fails to explicitly take account of the undercount among Spanish-speaking groups.

In an accompanying footnote to the above statement, the following clarification is provided.

> It is important to note that, because certain Spanish speaking groups, like the Chicanos, are often referred to as "browns", many persons mistakenly

believe that they are included in the Census Bureau figures for "non-whites". This is not the case. Unless they classify themselves as black, persons of Spanish ancestry are automatically classified by the Census Bureau with "whites". A disproportionate number of persons of Spanish ancestry classified themselves as other races on the 1970 Census forms.

The National Council of La Raza observes that neither the Census Bureau, nor the Urban League Data Service provide within their statistical systems, any indication on the extent of "other races" self classification. For example, the Bureau of Census has stated in its introduction of the June 1973, Persons of Spanish Origin: Subject Report(pc(2)-I c; Table I p. IX), that there are a total of 459,934 Spanish Origin blacks, 26,859 Spanish Origin Indians, and 122,302 Spanish Origin "other" persons. There is no indication how the Bureau arrived at the above mentioned statistical breakdown, when the only identifier appearing on the Census questionaire to identify the Hispanic American population is listed as:*

13b. Is this person's origin or descent— *(Fill one circle)*

O Mexican	O Central or South American
O Puerto Rican	O Other Spanish
O Cuban	O No, none of these

When based on only these six identifiers,it is unclear what other determinants are used to arrive at the aforementioned racial or ethnic definitions and statistics relating to black, Indian and "other" sub-groupings. Or, for that matter, the categorical breakdown appearing on its Table I. of the same Subject Report:

* The Census Bureau notes in its report on Characteristics of The Low-Income Population 1971, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 86, December 1972: "Origin or Descent. Data on ethnic origin or descent were derived from responses to the question 'What is this person's origin or descent?' No attempt was made to define the terms..." See pg. 20.

TABLE I. Persons of Spanish Origin by Race, for the United States: 1970

Race	All persons of Spanish origin[1]	Persons of Mexican origin	Persons of Puerto Rican origin	Persons of Cuban origin
Number:				
Total	9,072,602	4,532,435	1,429,396	544,600
White	8,466,126	4,446,584	1,323,537	522,623
Negro	454,934	24,148	75,920	17,151
Indian	26,859	15,988	1,038	161
Filipino	2,381	1,156	130	355
Other	122,302	44,559	28,771	4,310
Percent distribution:				
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White	93.3	98.1	92.6	96.0
Negro	5.0	0.5	5.3	3.1
Indian	0.3	0.4	0.1	–
Filipino	–	–	–	0.1
Other	1.3	1.0	2.0	0.8

[1] Includes Central or South American and other Spanish origin not shown separately.

The National Council further observes a continuation of discrepancies in the Census Bureau's conclusion that, "93.3% of all persons of Spanish origin were reported as white."* Another contradiction can be found upon reviewing the previously mentioned Urban League Data Service Report on Census data. It states that, "a disproportionate number"who were classified as white by the Bureau of Census had identified their origin as "other races". Although such classification is not provided for, either in the census questionaire, or the Census Report. That study does not make clear how within Census Bureau statistics, those identifying as "other races"are in fact automatically included in the white category, and if so, the criteria for such automatic inclusion. Additionally, it is not clear whether such "other races"

* Inasmuch as the U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, notes in its June 30, 1972 Annual Report that there were as many as 64,000 Filipino immigrants between 1963 and 1969 alone; some question might be raised about the Filipino count as well.

classification had the same automatic statistical consequences in the Urban League study. The above questions become significant when we attempt to examine the criteria for identifying the population count of those states with the largest number of Spanish origin people such as New York, California and Texas, which are--according to the Urban League's study--States with the largest "non-white population" undercount. Similarly, Metropolitan areas with large numbers of Spanish-origin people, New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Newark, Trenton, Houston, etc. are also areas with the largest non-white undercounts. The Urban League Data Service's report on the Census undercount does not, however, differentiate the extent of the non-black percentage within the non-white category it has used for the purposes of its analysis.

The significance of Estimating the 1970 Census Undercount for State and Local Areas, is that the Urban League's apparent access to the 1970 Census Forms forced it to conclude that:

1. a disproportionate number of Spanish-origin persons classified themselves as neither black, nor white;

2. The term "non-white," although including non-blacks, is analysed as if black and non-white are synonymous; and

3. the Urban League accepts the view that the Spanish-origin person undercount is probably larger than for blacks.

Though there is an explicit awareness of the problem posed by current classifications and definitions, the above report, does not appear to recognize the inappropriateness of the term non-white

as synonymous with black, even in view of Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-46, Exhibit K, Race and Color Designations in Federal Statistics which is a policy rejecting the use of the term "non-white":

> The designation "non-white" is not acceptable for use in the presentation of Federal Government Statistics. It is not to be used in any publication of statistical data or in the text of any statistical report.

Such use is also statistically inaccurate, for as noted on page 150 in its comment on "Race Differentials", the 1974 Economic Report of the President by the Council of Economic Advisors, less than 90 percent of the so-called "non-whites"are black! The statistical significance of that 10 percent is considerable.

The conclusions of the above study are based on the utilization of statistical analysis from available white/non-white data. This analysis/interpretation, in making a case for a redistribution policy of the General Revenue Sharing funds particularly, reflects the application of a fundamentally biracial white-black methodology, to an admitted multi-racial/ethnic condition.

In the previously mentioned cases, those of the private R & D institutions and quasi-public commissions which generally bring together outstanding leaders form outside of government (many of which come from the private R & D sector), the heavy reliance on the federal information system is obvious. The products of the commissions and institutes strongly suggest that such information provided to and requested by policy-research groups and policy

advisory groups is so limited that it is utterly useless with regard to the Hispanic-American. In virtually all cases there is a drastic confusion over definitions. Thus, in the above instances, the "Spanish-speaking" are defined as: "Mexican-Americans," and "other Caucasians," while in other examples, "Spanish speaking" become identified as, "other minority," "negro and others" and "other races." Thus, the Hispanic American becomes a statistical non-entity for policy purposes in the area of economic considerations, while at the same time, appearing to be nowhere, and everywhere in all definitions and classifications.

In no case, however, are the actual interests of the Hispanic American subgroups included in terms of policy posture in whatever definition is applied.

The consequences of these definitions are that solutions to social and economic needs are being developed on a biracial basis, which excludes those who are defined as neither white, nor black. The solutions do not, in fact, contain either the conceptual or the practical framework of the multi-cultural and multi-ethnic America. The fundamental social and economic policies of the nation are being developed on theoretical models that are biracially-oriented and fortified by statistics that are, on the whole, biracially-oriented.

The biracial approach for social and economic theory and policy-making is most evident and clear in the past and present practices and policies of the Office of Management and Budget of

the Executive Office of the President, which filter down towards every agency of the federal government, in turn impact upon nearly every State and local governmental agency, and ultimately affect virtually every major private institution's data and information systems including the media and communications apparatus in the country.

The nation's intelligentia, its public affairs scholars, its leaders of social and economic research and its advocates of reform, rely heavily on the information that government makes available or accessable. In turn, the nation's intellectuals and writers are heavily relied upon by the general public and by government to help define national solutions. Yet the failure of scholarship and the presentation of facts about the conditions and make-up of American society is nowhere more evident than in the incredible mono-cultural insensitivity so pervasive today among scholars.* This insensitivity towards the full context of the racial-ethnic question has served to reinforce the inordinate parochial perspective of the Federal agencies, depriving many agencies the opportunity to institute vital basic and applied research and sound developmental activities from which the community-at-large can benefit.

---

*Various professional journals - e.g. AGENDA, Aztlan - Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts, El Cuaderno, El Grito - A Journal of Contemporary Mexican-American Thought, and The Rican - Journal of Contemporary Puerto Rican Thought - regularly address this concern from a Hispanic American perspective. Other journals, such as Caribbean Studies, International Migration Review, and The Journal of Ethnic Studies, provide for various perspectives. The authors also point to such excellent studies as Roger Bastide's African Civilisations in the New World (Toronto, 1971), and H. Hoetink's Slavery and Race Relations in the Americas (Toronto, 1973). The National Council of La Raza itself grew out of a 1966 study by E. Galarza, H. Gallegos, and J. Samora relating to the same issue. The study was published as Mexican-Americans in the Southwest (Golita, California, 1969).

HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL SKETCH

Throughout the world one finds ethnicity and race a significant and often determinative factor in the governmental and private sectors' formulation and implementation of social, economic, political and cultural policies. This is no less the case in the United States of America.

United States history is very much a history of the politics of race and ethnicity--beginning with the acceptance of its Constitution and its policies on the negro and the Native American people. That history provides a key to the understanding of the development of this nation.

The issue of race is a complex one and was so recognized by the Founding Fathers. History has not simplified that issue--if anything, it has made it more complex. The acquisition of new territories added to the dimension of the issue and the politics of race, although this seems part of a distant and hazy past having little bearing on the postindustrial society. Yet, the dimension and the implications of New Spain--as the Western Hemisphere lands were once called--form a major part of the politics of race and ethnicity in the United States.

The Spanish-speaking issue in this country continues to be fostered in terms of ethnicity and immigration, as if the historical development of Hispanic American people were fundamentally similar to the development of the European ethnic and immigrant history.

The issue superimposes on the Hispanic American terms which have been defined appropriate to the economic, social, cultural and political makeup and background of European immigrants – terms that are foreign to the Western Hemisphere residents.

The Spanish-speaking issue is, in fact, two-fold: One issue involving this country's historical relationship with Spain: the other, the indigenous characteristics of people of Central, South, and North America once ruled by Spain. Politically, in the sphere of foreign policy this nation has responded to only one element of this two-fold factor. The United States has developed foreign policies towards Spain and the governments of Latin American countries. It has not developed a domestic policy towards those Hispanic people indigenous to the Western Hemisphere who became part of the United States during its territorial expansion into the Southwest and the Caribbean.

The conquest of the new territories added a new dimension to race and ethnicity. For, with exceptions, these Western Hemisphere residents can trace their ethnicity back not only to the invaders from Spain, but beyond, to the indigenous Native American population, and. in many cases, to Africans as well. Caribbean and South and Central American residents and the Hispanic Americans in the Southwestern States are not only different from the European immigrants of the North in terms of culture and national origin, they also are racially and ethnically different. The consequence of history has been the melting of the three races in some areas

of two races in others, and a further melting of the racially mixed. On the whole, the influence of the Indian race is found throughout.[24] Racial purity in terms of Black or White is not characteristic of the dominant population, although there are large numbers of Indians throughout the Central and South American states. There are, however, Caucasians, both recent European immigrants and land owners of long standing, who imposed their caste system on this indigenous population. In that the Spanish appear to constitute a small segment of the total population, it should be noted that although virtually all can claim a Spanish heritage in the cultural sense, many can, and do claim Spanish ancestry, descent or origin in the genetic sense. But, only an immigrant from Spain can claim Spanish national origin in its literal meaning. Much of the historical confusion surrounding the use of the prefix "Spanish" has been attributed to the imposition of the European social caste system introduced into the Western Hemisphere by the so-called "Discoverer of the new world."

In terms of its domestic development, the politics of race and ethnicity of the United States has evolved from admitted violation of treaties with and policies toward the Native American nations; legal and Constitutional issues with respect to the enslaved black people; and, European national origin, social and legal issues. To a large extent, the national origin issue arising over the various

---

[24]For a discussion of this, see, for example, Magnus Mörner, Race Mixture in the History of Latin America. (Boston, 1967); Manuel P. Servin, The Mexican-Americans: An Awakening Minority. (Toronto, 1970); T. Lynn Smith, Studies of Latin American Societies (New York, 1970).

Asian-American minorities, has been closely related to foreign policy matters, as is the case with regard to the Hispanic American. Apart from the particular policies adopted by the United States toward the Native American, the history of the United States in terms of race/ethnicity has been essentially a bi-polar matter of black and white, with its policies, laws, and Constitutional changes, as well as its administrative activities reflecting that political and socioeconomic historical context.

In terms of Hispanic American development, the prevailing biracial context of national domestic policies is, detrimental to the institution of policies that respond to the multi-ethnic and multi-racial context or framework of conditions in the United States. Classifications, definitions and terminology used by policy-makers are useless in such a context.

A review of past racial/ethnic policies of the United States indicates that there have been few tangible advantages to be attained through the mere inclusion of the Hispanic American within such umbrella terms as white, Caucasian or European. The beneficiaries of economic and social development continue to be European-origin ethnics and the policies continue to reflect and define their interests. A similar review of the Hispanic American experience within the umbrella terms used to identify "minority groups" reveals that such a policy defined and reflected the interests of black ethnics.

The issue of racial/ethnic definitions, data and policies is very much tied to the development of this nation toward overcoming both the vestiges of the exploitation of black people which goes back to the legal institution of slavery. The extent to which this nation is embroiled in that issue is an indication of how far this nation has yet to go to recognize and understand the nature, neglect and exploitation of the minorities in the Americas.

One historical consequence of this lack of understanding has been the acceptance of expedient classifications and policies which make the Hispanic American a part of a dual world with dual standards. The Hispanic American is defined as "white" and a "minority"--without being part of either, in that institutions, structures, policies, and practices have not been changed from "Anglo-American" to "American". Both history and the policies and politics of contemporary America, reveal that the systematic exploitation of minority people who are culturally and ethnically different continues unabated. Thus, ethnicity and race remain significant factors with regard to Hispanic Americans and the development of policies that would enhance their social, economic, political and cultural opportunities and rights within our society's structure.

PROBLEMS OF CURRENT DEFINITIONS

An assessment of the Hispanic American dilemma must take place both within the historical and the contemporary context. Parallel with the historical confusion and the confusion resulting from the utilization of biracial methodologies in policy-oriented research, there are other major complicating factors. One deals with certain basic misconceptions by the general public; the other deals with the definitions of the Hispanic American. All these factors interrelate.

When the issue of the Spanish speaking is raised in a public context, it generally becomes identified with certain stereotypes or standard misconceptions which include the following:

1. The Spanish speaking issue is primarily rural, migrant, farm worker.
2. The Spanish speaking problem is an immigrant problem facing the Spanish ethnic group, similar to the problems faced by other European national origin immigrants.
3. The Spanish speaking issue is a confusing political debate on the adequacies of the Census.
4. The issue is basically one of employing the disadvantaged unemployed, most of whom have various English language problems.

Within such a framework of public perspective, the validity of the Hispanic American as a national issue of major social and economic import, is fully undermined. Within such a framework, the Hispanic American issue becomes thoroughly confusing, for the media, scholars, politicians and others. Adding to this confusion are the issues confronting the status of the Commonwealth of Puerto

Rico, the Cuban refugees and Mexican National migrant workers. In short, no comprehensive social, economic, cultural, or political picture emerges from this complex setting.

Gradually there is developing a new understanding of the Hispanic American issue. The public has yet to fully recognize that the Hispanic American is the most urbanized minority group in the country. More than four out of five Hispanic Americans reside in urban settings. That the plight of the farm worker has achieved prominence is largely due to the dedicated work of the United Farm Workers and its leaders. That plight is, however, only one facet of the Hispanic American condition. Further, most Hispanic Americans are neither farm, nor migrant farm workers, although large sectors of the most exploited group, are Hispanic American, primarily Mexican-American and Puerto Rican.

Another perspective that tends to add to the confusion is the notion that the Spanish speaking are essentially Spaniards and Spanish immigrants. Many Hispanic Americans are proud in tracing their origins to the indigenous cultures of the Americas. The Spanish language of these native Americans is, moreover, quite different from the Castillian. The fundamental issue facing most Hispanic Americans is largely an ethnic/cultural one, a minority issue, in contrast to the solely national origins issue implied in the term Spanish.

A third confusing factor is the Census undercount debate

itself. The whole debate of statistical and other information on the Hispanic American has continuously orbited around the identification inadequacies of the Census. While the significance of Census data is quite evident from the extent to which that data is used in the formulation of policies at state, local and federal levels, it is also obvious that the Census data is not the only information system being used for policy-making purposes. The focus on Census inadequacies has served to detract from the question of how such data is used by the various agencies outside the Bureau of Census, as well as to detract attention from other data systems.

The Hispanic American issue on undercount is one which affects the validity of the whole information and data gathering enterprise.

Compounding technical aspects of the undercount is the utilization of different identifiers for the Hispanic American in different parts of the country. Thus, for example, the Census Bureau notes that"in the five Southwestern States ... all persons of Spanish surname have been separately identified. About 4.7 million persons living in these States were identified as having a Spanish surname." This approach at identification of the number of Hispanic Americans was, apparently, not used in other areas of the country. A second identifier involved information on the birthplace of the persons counted, but, such identification incorporated only information concerning first and second generation immigrants from

such countries as Mexico, Cuba and Puerto Rico. "About 5.2 million persons in the United States were reported as of Spanish birth or parentage using this identifier." A third identifier asked for the language spoken in the person's home in early childhood. "Nearly eight million persons reported Spanish as that language." Under this identifier all other persons living with families in which the head or wife of the head of the household reported Spanish as the mother tongue were added, making the total "persons of Spanish language" some 9.6 million people. A fourth identifier involved Spanish-origin self-identification within the definitions offered.* This offered a choice to consider oneself Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, Other Spanish, or none of these. In each case, identifiers offered only those definitions used by the Census Bureau and did not encompass the full range of Hispanic Americans. There was no provision on the 1970 census questionaire for the identification of persons of Hispanic American background in the basic census questionaire. The terms used by the Census Bureau are essentially functional identifiers, rather than identifiers for the acquisition of data on all generations of persons of Hispanic American origin. Thus, in the 5-percent sample of the 1970 Census, the term "Spanish origin" was used; in the 15-percent sample the term "Spanish heritage" was used; and in the 100-percent basic questionaire an essentially national origin approach was used. All identifiers, by definition, excluded a number of Hispanic Americans who did not identify with or fit

* See pp. 39-40 of this Report.

into definitions or self-classifications offered to respondents.

It can be ascertained that the 1970 Census was not designed to function as a Census "count" or for identifying the Hispanic American population. It merely provided information about certain characteristics of Hispanic American groups within certain classifications, which are in effect, sub-classifications. A consequence of such a system is that it reduces the validity of comparisons between the various samples and the basic 100-percent census.

A fourth confusion relates to the issue of unemployment among the Spanish-speaking. While unemployment is a key issue, it is only one of numerous manpower and manpower-related problems facing the Hispanic American. Inherently related to the problem of high unemployment are such matters as, underemployment and misemployment, education, public services--e.g., health care public assistance, social security--housing, consumer protection and public safety, civil rights, and many other concerns of an economic nature. Unemployment is related to a mass of other issues and concerns. A key to understanding the problems facing the Hispanic American is the underutilization and neglect of the human talent, skills and resources which exist within this social spectrum. In short, the Hispanic issue relates to the whole economic and social fabric of the Nation and cannot be isolated into an issue of manpower development training of the disadvantaged.

Hispanic American issues could be summarized as being:

(1) Largely of an urban nature, (2) An ethnic minority issue, (3) Functually excluded from Federal data/information systems, and (4) of National Economic and Social Significance.

The failure to differentiate issues such as noted above has resulted in national, state and local policy postures and definitions on the Hispanic American which are archaic, confusing, and definitely detrimental to the rights and interests of the Hispanic American in General, and of each racial-ethnic subgroup in particular.

It is clearly in the interest of the public, of government, and of all minorities themselves, that a clear or unequivocal approach be taken to reduce confusion on the Spanish-speaking issues, as well as to provide for increased accuracy in information systems. Of great concern in that regard, is the definition of "Spanish speaking", "Spanish origin", "Spanish ancestry", "Spanish surname", and other such terms as presently used by the Census Bureau, Department of Labor and all other public agencies.

A brief review of current definitions will bring out certain other implications which can hardly be construed as beneficial toward a clearer understanding of the economic, social, political, or cultural interests of Hispanic Americans.

Spanish Speaking

The term "Spanish speaking" is as inappropriate and meaningless, as the term 'English speaking." The fact that many

people speak English does not make them English. The utilization of the term "English speaking" as the key identifier rather than the present dominating ethnic breakdown in Census data would raise havoc with much of this nation's information systems. It would no doubt lead to immense complications for whites and blacks. Using this analogy, it becomes clear as to what "Spanish speaking" does to the Hispanic American whose subgrouping identity is Chicano, Boricua, and other sectors of Caribbean, Mexican, Central and South American origins.

The prefix "Spanish" is highly misleading for linguistic differences in the similar sense that a Scandinavian and "Russian speaking" category would, if such terms respectively encompassed Swedes, Norwegians, Danes, and Icelanders or Ukrainians, Russians, Lithuanians, etc. The Bureau of Census explicitly recognizes national origin differentials. Yet, such a differential is often not applied equally with respect to the numerous native Hispanic subgroups. Further, in the Census defined category of persons of Spanish language, one finds those whose immediate origin goes back to Mexico, Cuba and Central and South America, but not often those who are now native Hispanic-American, namely the Chicano and Puerto Rican. Spanish speaking is one denominator which unites many Hispanic-Americans. But as noted above, it is not an accurate, functional ethnic characteristic for identification purposes of that population sector in the United

States, in the same manner that "English speaking" is not the accurate ethnic denominator that provides for understanding of who the other elements of the U.S. population are.

Spanish Surname

The term "Spanish surname" is equally inadequate, inappropriate and meaningless. This category means as much as "English surname." By contrast, the utilization of "English surname" as the key identifier for ethnic dominating categories would also make havoc of much of this nation's information systems, and lead to immense complications, as well as raise questions about its purpose or functionality. The surname issue presents these very terminological complications to the Chicano, Boricua and other Hispanic American sectors of Caribbean, Mexican, Central and South American origins.

Compounding the problem is the fact that there are many Hispanic Americans with Dutch, French, German, Irish, English, Native Indian and other non-Spanish surnames going back many generations. Further, many have acquired non-Spanish surnames in more recent generations through marriage. Still others with such surnames are only very distant or not at all Spanish or Hispanic-American origin. Others are from Spain. To complicate things further there are Portuguese, Brazilians and Asians who have "Spanish surnames." Finally, some have Anglicized their Spanish surnames--such as Rios to Rivers; Torres to Towers; Rabagos to Russell, etc..

Comments On Racial-Ethnic Definitions

Traditionally, several other generally used terms have been promoted by the Census Bureau and other agencies: Spanish-American,-Ancestry,-Origin,-Descent, and-Heritage. A literal interpretation of any of these definitions would immediately establish that such persons were being identified for purposes other than identification of the composition of the American population.

How many people fit such categories is not known, but, it is a comparatively small number since they are not even listed in the Census Bureau's National Origin and Language Subject Reports.

In the 1972 Annual Report of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization a breakdown has been provided on "Immigration by Country, for Decades: 1820-1972," and includes the following comparative statistics on immigration:

From 1820-1972 there were an estimated

233,519 immigrants from Spain

1,707,125 immigrants from Mexico

234,177 immigrants from Central America

536,786 immigrants from South America

The largest immigration from Spain took place in 1911-1920 (68,611). Only in three other decades have there been more than 10,000 Spanish immigrants-1901 to 1910 (27,935); 1921-1930 (28,958); and the 1961 to 1970 period (52,504). The Spanish population constitutes a very small though not insignificant segment of the Spanish-American (Spanish-origin,-ancestry, etc.) population.

Information and research on its make-up is quite appropriate. It is probably correct to state that by definition, this may be the only significant "Caucasian" Spanish American population sector that is Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed. Yet it is this latter definition that the Census Bureau and other agencies are in fact utilizing.

It appears as though the above categories of origin, heritage or ancestry reach to the root of the problem of definitions for purposes of identification by the agencies. Thus, for example, in a 1970 study prepared for the Colorado Civil Rights Commission under the auspices of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Spanish Surnamed American Employment In The Southwest, the authors note that the "Spanish speaking Americans" are the "second oldest" minority, as well as the "second largest" minority. It then defines the "Spanish speaking" as an "ethnic minority." It goes on to state that: "Its members are of one race and one religion with the country's majority. They are white, Caucasian; they are Christian. They descend from Europeans."[25]

The report by the Institute of Industrial Relations went to great lengths to point to the cultural origins of the "Spanish-speaking", "a culture stemming from the Greeks and the Romans." Thus having provided a racial definition and a cultural definition of the Hispanic American in general, and of Mexican Americans in particular, the report goes on to note that:

---

[25] Spanish Surnamed American Employment in the Southwest, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Los Angeles, n.d., p. 4.

> The Spanish often mingled with and joined the indigenous populations into their society. The multifarious people who issued from this joining cannot now be distinguished by the usual designation of race, creed, color, or national origin. To the contrary, their distinction is that no one of these, nor all of them, suffices to describe their distinctiveness.[26]

The explanation provided by this study for utilizing the terms "Spanish speaking Americans," "Spanish American" and "Spanish surnamed", in spite of the self-acknowledged ambiguity and lack of functional precision is that:

> Purely local colloquialisms such as Mexican-Americans, Latins, and Latin Americans may be offensive in some areas. The extreme sensitivity of slotting people who range, ethnically, from Indian to unmixed Spanish ancestry is apparent. This explains part of the problem of giving this group a statistical existence.[27]

The implications of the EEOC-sponsored report's conceptualization are as revealing, as they are contradictory and inadequate. On the one hand it defines Mexican-Americans as White Caucasians; on the other, it concludes that the Spanish mingled with other races are no longer Europeans, but a distinct ethnic, racial, color and national origin group.

This accepted non-Caucasian and non-white admitted reality is at odds with the "White," "Caucasian" and "European" definition that is officially sanctioned. The official sanction and advocacy on behalf of "whiteness" is in fact a preferential selection from among the two major racial choices in the United States - i.e.

---

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid., p. 5.

black and white. The preferential selection of white dominancy that is made through the definitions is an ill-conceived preferential choice reflecting negatively on a major ethnic element of our society which culturally and ethnically comes under the Hispanic American umbrella. Revealing, however, is the belief that Mexican culture is Greek and Roman culture, and that the Spanish "joined the native Indian population into their society." In other words, the Indians joined the white Spanish society.

Using these assumptions, the Bureau of Census June 1973 Subject Report on Persons of Spanish Origin has identified a total of 26,859 persons of Spanish origin who are "Indian," out of a total of 9,072,602 persons of Spanish origin and 8,466,126 who are defined as "white." At the same time this Subject Report of the Bureau of Census notes:

> The category of "white" includes persons who indicated their race as white, as well as persons who did not classify themselves in one of the specific race categories on the questionaire but entered Mexican, Puerto Rican, or a response suggesting Indo-European stock... The category of "Indian" includes persons who indicated their race as American Indian or who did not indicate a specific race category but reported the name of an Indian tribe.[28]

What has taken place is a terrible misconstruction of the history, culture, and society of the Hispanic American and of his contribution culturally and ethnically to the Western Hemisphere. Such definitions and rationales which have been expounded by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission-

---

[28]Persons of Spanish Origin, Bureau of the Census, June 1973, Appendix C, p. 6.

sponsored study, and in a parallel manner, by the Bureau of Census, totally ignored the overwhelming evidence of the particular non-European contribution.

The fact is most Hispanic Americans of Central, South and North American origin can be defined ethnically and culturally as neither black nor white.

It is only through the best facts that definitions must be developed to give the Hispanic groups an accurate statistical existence that is uniform and functional, yet flexible in its sub-categories to take account of the unique sensitivities of each distinct subgroup. The present definitions have allowed and contributed to the continued statistical non-existence of the Hispanic American in most areas of government and have fostered statistically useless definitions of that ethnic population. This has done great harm to the cause of advancing the economic, social, cultural, and political interests of the Hispanic American.

III. FEDERAL AGENCIES: CURRENT ROLE OF THE HISPANIC AMERICANS IN INFORMATION SYSTEMS

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET: RACIAL/ETHNIC DATA POLICY

Historically, the Office of Management and Budget(OMB), like many other agencies of the Federal Government working with statistical services, has recognized the limitations of the Federal information systems with regard to the Hispanic American. Such recognition has not, however, resulted in a revision of existing Federal statistical policies to overcome and eliminate such limitations.

Fundamental direction on the racial/ethnic data question is set by the OMB, which is the designated Federal administrative agent responsible for the efficient operation and coordination of federal statistical services systems, under the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, 31 U.S.C. Sec. 18b.

OMB has provided limited direction on the policies relating to racial and ethnic classifications. Its policy on definitions and classifications in information systems refer only to two racial groups: white and negro. Although authority on issuing regulations on statistical procedures was assigned to the old Bureau of the Budget through Executive Order 10253, of June 13, 1951, and though that authority was transferred to OMB under the President's 1970 Reorganization Plan No. 2, present OMB policy does not require the collection of racial-ethnic data, nor does it require the separate enumeration of particular racial/ethnic groups in those cases where racial/ethnic data is collected. The only prohibition on classifications is the term "non-white". A whole array of other classifications, designations or definitions are permissible. There is no stated OMB policy on the Hispanic American. No guidelines on definitions are provided, nor any

provisions on whether Hispanic American (Spanish-speaking, -surnamed, -ancestry, etc.) should or should not be included in "white", "minority", or "negro and other" categories. One consequence is that Federal agencies use different classification systems making any comparative analyses between many agency information systems virtually impossible.

With respect to Hispanic Americans and the various subgroups in that population, the lack of a clearly formulated OMB policy with regard to the use of racial/ethnic definitions, has resulted in procedures for statistical regulation that have not served to increase the amount or quality of racial/ethnic data available or useable for Federal-wide program planning and evaluation.

The significance of decisions allowing utilization of old definitions and classifications becomes clearer in view of the recent emphasis on civil rights.

OMB has instituted a policy requiring that civil rights issues be included in the budget hearing processes and the performance management system. However, it has not instituted a policy of requiring improvements in the quality and accuracy of racial/ethnic data for use in the budget hearing processes. The importance of this factor becomes even more evident as a result of the officially established, functional relationship between OMB's Statistical Policy Division and Budget Examination Division. Further, responsibility for the clearance of the administrative forms for data gathering purposes, is now in the latter Division.

The authority of the Office of Management and Budget includes responsibility for racial/ethnic data forms used by all Federal agencies, as well as the regulation of the procedures for

the use of definitions in statistical systems. Though exercising the function of racial/ethnic data and information systems as a key component of the budgetary planning process at the national level, it has yet to exercise its authority to improve data and utilize such data in the budgetary processes on behalf of the Hispanic Americans. On the contrary, it had issued for comment, proposed amendments to the March 28, 1952, Bureau of the Budget Circular A - 46, which sets forth requirements on Federal statistics that gives Federal agencies two alternative racial/ethnic data system options. Proposed by then Associate Director of OMB, Frank C. Carlucci, the suggested alternatives were:

a. American-Indian, Asian American, Negro/Black, white, Spanish descent, and other.

b. American Indian, Asian American, Negro/black, white, and other combined with the ethnic categories of Spanish descent and other. [29]

Neither proposed revisions request data on Mexican Americans, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cuban, Central and South Americans, or Filipinos. The proposed changes would in fact appear to be no significant change for the Hispanic American, and in some instances, even complicate matters further since the parameters of the proposed terms are not defined. Thus, OMB is allowing agencies to define their own terms, and is permitting the use of different data collection systems among different agencies, making comparing of such data practically meaningless.

It becomes obvious from the years of activities by OMB and other agencies with regard to the racial/ethnic data question,

---

[29] To Know Or Not To Know: Collection and Use of Racial and Ethnic Data in Federal Assistance Programs, U. S. Civil Rights Commission, April 1973, pp. 71-72.

that considerable attention has been given to that question as it pertains to the Hispanic American issue. Significant factors which have not been publicly addressed are the lack of theoretical approaches to: (1) the defining of essential meanings of ethnicity, (2) terms used for ethnic designations, (3) relationship of ethnicity to economic, social and cultural structure, and (4) implications of Hispanic American ethnicity in political settings.

The above proposed alternatives by the former Associate Director of OMB, Frank Carlucci, have policy implications which have not been elaborated upon. An official statement of the impact of the proposed classifications on social and economic policies, on the budgetary review and examination processes, and, on the Federal performance management systems would help provide for the needed functional and practical definition of the proposed racial/ethnic categories.

It may be useful to note that because of the potential quantitative impact of the definition of "Spanish descent" on the budgetary and economic planning processes, a clearer definition is a fiscal necessity. A loose or ambiguous definition of the Spanish descent group can only facilitate a loose or ambiguous fiscal and management policy towards the Hispanic American and an equally ambiguous evaluation of the performance and management of public policy visa vis the Hispanic American constituency.

The clearest illustration of that ambiguity by OMB is perhaps found in the "Federal Civil Rights Activities" chapter in the Special Analysis - Budget of the United States Government - Fiscal Year 1975. In this 18-page analysis of Federal civil rights activities, the only mention of the "Spanish-descent" are brief notes of:

1. "the 16 point Presidential mandate to provide opportunities for Spanish-speaking citizens" in the context of management and executive level Federal jobs;

2. "steps to end discrimination against Spanish-speaking and other non-English speaking pupils" (an implicit reference to the Lau vs. Nichols Supreme Court decision), and

3. the activities of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish Speaking people, under the heading of "Civil Rights research and information dissemination".

No mention of Federal civil rights activities is made under the other major areas noted in the Special Analysis: Military Services Equal Opportunities, Private Sector Opportunities, Fair Housing, Civil Rights Conciliation and Prevention of Disputes and Minority Business Enterprise. Similarly, although civil rights activities for women is noted on numerous occasions, no mention is made of Hispanic American women. Although the Special Analysis does not provide for a substantive analysis of the projected Federal policies' impact on the various minorities, it does indicate the limited extent of Federal policy commitment on behalf of the Hispanic American for FY 1975.

The same condition prevails vis-a-vis the February 4, 1974 Budget Message of the President, and the Economic Report of the President of February 1, 1974 by the President's Council of Economic Advisors. The latter's specific concern for minorities extends to the black minority group alone; and its concern for women economic

opportunities does not address the interests of minority women.[30]

Both the Economic Report and the Budget are key instruments in the presentation and development of national policy postures. The advanced nature of data systems for the black minority groups and for women has permitted the systematic explicit inclusion of some of the interests of such groups, inadequate though such inclusions may be with regard to their groups. The absence of such a minimal inclusion of Hispanic Americans interests rests largely on either the Executive Office's Domestic Council, or the Office of Management and Budget, or both. The latter agency, however, is the agency responsible for the management information system (MIS) which provides the Domestic Council and the President with the information and data through which policy options are assessed and evaluated at those levels.

In November 1970, the Interagency Racial Data Committee initiated a joint effort with OMB to improve racial/ethnic data systems in the Federal government. The Committee had been organized at the request of an OEO Task Force on Uniform Civil Rights Policies and Practices, headed at that time by Frank C. Kent, Associate Director of OEO for Human Rights.

This Interagency Committee worked for nearly two years to deal with basic issues of racial/ethnic data policies, and, produced a two-volume report on December 1972 entitled,

---

[30] The Economic Report also comments on the term non-white in its brief discussion of Race Differentials and notes that " almost 90 percent of non-white are blacks, but many of the available data do not distinguish between black and other non-whites ". (see p. 150 of the 1974 Economic Report of the President.)

Establishing a Federal Racial/Ethnic Data System. Throughout the report there is an emphasis on the role that the Office of Management and Budget must play if significant progress in the racial data area is to be made. Specifically noted is the following:

> the numerous inconsistencies in the agencies' present racial data practices, and the systematic nature of many of the deficiencies we observed, make it clear that some general guidance is required to make the government's racial data capability reasonably uniform and effective. Naturally, the agencies look primarily to the Office of Management to provide them with guidance and assistance in these matters, since they involve government-wide statistical and management policies. [31]

The Interagency Committee also noted the existence of an OMB Racial Data Task Force, and the latter's support for "the ultimate connection between racial data reports and budget submissions."

Of particular interest with respect to the two task forces is the apparent absence of any role by the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish Speaking People in their activities, even though a considerable amount of discussion on the Spanish-speaking took place, according to the above report and communications from OMB. Nor does there appear to have been significant, if any, input by Hispanic American civil rights and other interest groups, or participation by individual Hispanic Americans in these task forces. The Interagency Racial Data Committee's report indicates no communication with any Hispanic American organization.

---

[31] See in "Office of Management and Budget Racial/Ethnic Data Policies", Letter to Frank Carlucci, Associate Director of OMB, in Establishing a Federal Racial/Ethnic Data System, Vol. 2, B-5.

As far as can be discerned from the activities of these Federal agency activities and discussions, the underlying problem is one of a conflict between the utilization of an ethnic classification for the Hispanic American, and the utilization of a national origin classification. That is, little if any serious consideration had been given to a classification for Hispanic Americans which is "neither black, nor white". A basic objection noted by some non-Hispanic American groups to the current definitions used to identify the Hispanic Americans is that the various umbrella terms do not assure equal treatment among the different nationality groups. Yet the implications of the national origin sub-classification seems not to have been thoroughly considered. For in redefining the Hispanic American identifier on the level of nationality, it places that sector of the population on the level of other national origin subgroups, rather than on the level of a "minority group".

There is distinct difference between a minority group and a national origin group - a difference recognized in terms of national economic and social policies, as well as a lengthy, broad-ranging legal history relative to civil and minority rights. The impact of a national origin policy applied to black people could be both meaningless and disastrous to black people throughout the country, if a national origin breakdown analogous to Hispanic Americans were applied to the black population. At no time, however, would one give serious consideration to a policy of national origin subgrouping for black Americans in which such subgroups, as the following, were to be classified:

African origin
Cuban black
Mexican black
Puerto Rican black
Haitian
Asian black
Black native American
Dominican
West Indian black
South American black
Other Central American black
Polynesian
Other black origin

Together, the latter sectors might number in the millions, a significant sector of the present race/color umbrella terms. The impact of a national origin approach on black Americans'rights and interests could constitute major complications for policy-makers and change the nature of present concerted economic and social development policies toward civil rights and equal opportunities for "minorities".

The inclusion of these national origin groups into a white category in the manner presently prescribed by the Bureau of Census vis a vis Hispanic American groups could (1) drastically alter the characteristics of both the white and the black population; (2) make the ethnic classification systems meaningless in terms of a more accurate reflection os interests and needs of both ethnic groups; and (3) could well create a framework within which the primary beneficiaries of economic and social policies would tend to be European white ethnics rather than those various national origin subgroups that are - for statistical purposes - included in the white classification.

In terms of national economic policies, a purely national origin approach toward resolving Hispanic American needs and interests is as inconsistent as would be a national origin approach

toward resolving black American needs and interests. The consequences of such an approach would create a "double standard" for groups classified solely by national origin categories – for the national policy approach toward their rights would be fundamentally different. In the case of the Hispanic American, the current dual standard prevents the reorientation by government toward rights and needs of Hispanic Americans as either an identifiable minority group or as national origin subgroups.

Thus, for the purpose of social and economic identifiers, only black-minority and white-majority interests exist in OMB. By the current system of classifications utilized in OMB for social and economic purposes, Hispanic American, as well as Hispanic American subgroup interests, are not encompassed in either of the white or black need and interest classifications. This condition is evident from the absence of any role within social and economic indicators pertinent to either the Hispanic American or the national origin subgroups.

The key role played by the Office of Management and Budget is that of providing sound information to policy-making agencies and groups in the Executive Office of the President and to Congress, as well as State and local units of government. One major illustration of how far the exclusion of information on Hispanic American civil rights has gone within OMB can be assessed from an analysis of its publication of Social Indicators 1973. The activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

further illustrate that same condition. Even though two former OMB officials are now key officials in that Department, there is no indication of any effort to systematically advance the civil rights of the "Spanish descent people" or of the various national origin groups within that umbrella classification.

SOCIAL INDICATORS

The ethos of efficiency and effectiveness dominates the political, business, and social scenes. Management of policies, the budget, plans, programs and evaluations has become the style of recent Administrations. Efficiency and effectiveness have become popular terms from local to the national levels. Their popularity reflects the desire by administrators and the political leaders to produce programmatic solutions to social and economic needs whose products can be measurably demonstrated or verified as successful. Every government and every administration has been concerned with this issue. The enormous reorganization efforts during the present generation is the outgrowth of a long history of efforts to organize federal government more efficiently and effectively. Virtually all legislative measures bring about changes in governmental organization, as do administrative regulations, policies, and court decisions. Other factors, such as population changes and economic conditions, also have brought on a reorganization of administrative responses. The volume of special purposes subcommittees in Congress is a reflection of the organizational responses to specifically perceived needs and interests, as are the mass of statistical service systems within federal agencies. The Hoover Commission of the 1950's, and the efforts toward instituting the "PPBS" techniques in all major federal agencies during the 1960's, are significant illustrations of a modern government's attempt to come to grips with

management needs of the fourth largest nation in the world - in terms of population.

The present Administration's reorganization activities are an extension of the developments of previous years' activities. Major reorganization of our administrative apparatus would have taken place regardless of which political party was in office. Hence, the issue of reorganization is not simply a matter of efficiency or effectiveness of government responses to new and old needs and interests, but also a matter of efficiency and effectiveness "for whom?" The often used term within the current Administration of "management by objectives" raises the question of who is included within the objectives?

The reorganization entailed in general and special revenue sharing and consolidation, in decentralization and regionalization, has yet to be assessed in terms of their impact on America, although they are described and defended as part of moves toward efficiency. The creation of the Domestic Council to plan domestic policy, and the Office of Management and Budget, to see that the policy and the programs that flow from it are successfully carried out, places the issue of management by objectives at the highest level of government. Under such a system, organizational assignments and authority are clearly delineated and delegated from the top downward, and the issue of who is to be part of the objectives or benefit from the objectives, becomes very much an issue of a specifically defined inclusion within the information systems upon which policies

are based and objectives are plainly set out.

Within the framework of management by objectives, the role of economic and social indicators is a highly, significant, if not determinative one. Economic and social indicators provide for the statistical base which enables policy-makers to assess the existing conditions, determine what has to be done, and evaluate the impact of policies and programs. The use of the indicators-approach as a policy instrument has been stressed during the present Administration since the creation of the National Goals Research Staff in July of 1969 and the publication of its report, Toward Balanced Growth: Quantity with Quality, one year later. In a statement announcing the establishment of the National Goals Research Staff, the President explicitly noted the importance of "the collection, correlation, and processing of data relating to social needs, and in the projection of social trends."[32]

The importance of the social statistics activities of the Federal government has been underscored by OMB's publication of Social Indicators 1973, which was developed by Daniel B. Tunstall of the Statistical Policy Division of OMB. The Census Bureau participated in the research and development of the report which is projected as a publication on an annual basis. It is a

---

[32] Statement of the President announcing establishment of National Goals Research Staff, July 13, 1969, in Report of the National Goals Research Staff, Toward Balanced Growth: Quantity with Quality, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, July 4, 1970, p. 223.

258-page "collection of statistics selected and organized to describe social conditions and trends in the United States". "The concerns have been defined and selected to reveal the general status of the entire population; to depict conditions that are, or are likely to be, dealt with by national policies; and to encompass many of the important issues facing the Nations." "The concerns thus embody widely held basic social objectives..."

The 1973 collection focuses on eight social areas: health, public safety, education, employment, income, housing, leisure and recreation, and population. The report states that "in almost every case, the national totals are disaggregated to show at least the age, sex, and racial characteristics of the population. The degree of detail varies from indicator to indicator and, wherever possible, has been determined by identifying these groups in the population which are most vulnerable to, or most affected by, a peculiar condition or which represent a unique situation."

The Introduction to the report notes that "the main reason for this disaggregation is to identify and compare significant groups within the population and to show their changing conditions relative to each other and to their national average". According to its authors, the report "is restricted almost entirely to data about objective conditions" and most of the data included "have been taken from federal sources; their quality can be verified by those agencies".

Although the express function of the report was to have been the identification and comparison of "significant groups" within the population to show their changing conditions, what must

be highlighted about this report is that not once throughout its more than 260 pages was the existence of Hispanic Americans noted. Further, "racial characteristics" have been defined exclusively in terms of Black and White.

The journalist, Joseph R. Slevin, commenting in the Philadelphia Inquirer last year in an article on "U.S. Set to Publish Social Indicators", stated that "social policy planners soon will have a better idea of where the country has been and where it can hope to go". Apparently drawing upon OMB sources, he added that "officials expect that federal planners will use the indicators to measure performances of a broad range of social programs". Slevin noted that "the new guide is being put together under the direction of Dr. Julius Shiskin, Chief Statistician of OMB. Shiskin has been working on the project since he and former Daniel Patrick Moynihan came up with the idea in mid-1969."

An August 19, 1974, New York Times article, entitled "Changes in Social Attitudes Monitored in Broad Surveys of the Quality of Life", by Robert Reinhold, deals with the same item: "According to Daniel B. Tunstall, who heads the project, the idea is to provide a kind of handbook for policy makers to evaluate social needs".

The simple question of what happens to the more than ten million racial/ethnic minority people that happen to be Hispanic Americans is quite clear. OMB's "new guide" and "handbook for policy makers" simply does not encompass the existence of non-black minorities. Using the data and perspectives provided in

the Social Indicators 1973, how will the conditions of Hispanic Americans be dealt with by national policies? The utilization of the report by policy makers can only lend itself to the systematic exclusion, that is: Hispanos are non-citizens when federal government gets down to the business of planning, budgeting, and program evaluation.

If the Social Indicators approach provides for an "indicator" of how policies have been, are actually being, or will be, evolved in this government, one can readily conclude that Hispanos will continue to be systematically deprived of Constitutional rights. In legal terms, OMB policies, at this stage, could be construed to be a travesty on the whole concept of equity and equality "equal protection under law", particularly since they resulted from factors over which OMB does have control, legislative and administrative responsibility.

OMB had no compelling need to develop the kind of limited racial classification as it did through, Social Indicators 1973. Its current classification system is not merely suspect, it is also"rational" in the sense that it indicates it "opted out" alternatives to the biracial classification approach. Further, the biracial classification involves a substantial infringement upon fundamental rights of the Hispanic Americans when it is used as, or becomes, a major determinant of chances for economic, social, cultural, and political success in the nation's competitive society. Similarily, the exclusion of the Hispano American on the

basis of the wealth of information of the Black and White population, or on the basis of the government's self-imposed poverty of information on the Hispano American and other non-Black racial minorities, must raise substantial questions.

The decision to allot more information to a majority or one minority, at the exclusion of another minority, merely because of the fortuitous presence of such information, is to place the burden of public social and economic policy development entirely on the resources of the excluded minority.

A federal planning, budgeting and evaluation system which classifies on the basis of "information wealth" most drastically affects the poor Hispano Americans' development who are forced to compete for attention and resources with the information advantaged sectors of society whc alone have access to the particular kind of data and information prescribed as a requirement for policy-formulation and policy-making by the policy-making institutions.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The emphasis on results-oriented methods for managing is nowhere more obvious in the field of social services, than in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Department's Operational Planning System (OPS) specifically include the "principles of management by objectives" as the approach to efficiency and effectiveness within all agencies, including their regional offices. The 1972 DHEW Operational Planning System Handbook delineates the role of management by objectives within agency operations. It notes that:

> Through OPS, HEW has tailored management by objectives to fit its particular needs to:
> - define explicitly the objectives and results expected from Departmental actions and expenditures
> - measure periodically the progress toward achievement of the objectives
> - surface existing or potential problems which would prevent the accomplishment of objectives, thereby enabling management to take corrective action that increases the probability of successful accomplishment
> - ensure the implementation of decisions made in the processes of long-range planning, budgeting, and policy development
> - ensure the implementation of new legislation and new initiatives of the administration
>
> The operational objectives are the immediate steps that the Department must take to accomplish its long-range goals. Operational planning, therefore, provides the mechanism to move from general goals to the precise achievements required of the Department in a single fiscal year.[33]

Although there is a heavy emphasis on quantifiable objectives, measurable activities, and verifiable accomplishment, there is no guidance on what measuring tools the various agencies are to use. The Handbook does not deal with the operations of the agencies'

---

[33] Office of the Secretary, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, DHEW Operational Planning Systems Handbook, March 1972, pp.1-2.

statistical services systems, or the specially created information systems that supplement HEW agency activities, which have the data base upon which the OPS rests.

In view of the significance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare activities, it may be appropriate to briefly assess the role of several of its key statistical service systems, and note the adequacy of such systems with regard to the role they might play in advancing solutions to the social needs of Hispanic Americans. The Fiscal Year 1975 Budget also encourages such a review.

Federal outlays for manpower were $4.8 billion. By contrast, outlays for social programs involve - according to the FY 1975 Budget - more than $185 billion dollars (including education, health, income security, civil rights, and reduction of crime expenditures). The outlays for health are approximately seven times the amount for manpower; and the outlays for education three times the amount for manpower. Income security amounts to nearly $130 billion dollars in outlays. The combined outlays for civil rights and reduction of crime are significantly higher than the outlays for manpower development. Both the education and health outlays are higher than those of the Department of Agriculture.

The health, education, and welfare agencies of the Department of HEW perform an enormous role in the social and economic well-being of the nation. The questions raised by the management by objectives approaches are whether and how they advance the social and economic well-being of Hispanic Americans.

An assessment of the DHEW National Centers for Health, Social and Educational Statistics, should provide for an indication of the extent management by objectives automatically and systematically includes consideration for the needs and interests of this nation's second largest minority. Implicit in this is whether efficiency and effectiveness are at all possible within agency structures when the information base necessary for policy-making does not encompass useable information or any information on the Hispanic American?

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS

One of the most neglected fields of research and information gathering relative to the Hispanic American is to be found in health. At a time when serious consideration is being given to various national health insurance approaches, each containing the elements of major policy changes towards health services delivery systems, policy makers are confronted by an almost unprecedented situation. For virtually very little is known of the health conditions and needs of the Hispanic Americans. The status of the more than 10 million Hispanic Americans will have a great bearing on any national insurance program.

The National Center for Health Statistics plays a vital role in providing data and information upon which -- in part, at least - government bases its health policies. The numerous reports on the Center's 1969-70 Data from the National Health Survey published in 1972 and 1973, contain no information on Hispano Americans, although the survey made explicit provisions for the identification "color"category. The result is that we now have vital statistics on such matters as home care for the aged and chronically ill who are either white or black, but no vital statistics on the 10 million people in the U.S. whose background is Hispanic American.. Similarly, the Center's reports on, for example, Infant Mortality Rates: Socio-economic Factors (March 1972); Inpatient Utilization of Short-Stay Hospitals (March 1973); and The Leading Components of

Upturn in Mortality for Men: United States - 1952-67 (September 1971),,-- which is described as "An analysis of rising mortality among men by cause presented separately for white men and for men of other races" -- and its numerous other reports based on the National Vital Statistics System contain no information on the Hispanic American.

In short, the absence of natality, mortality, marriage/divorce, health examination, health resources, and health service data virtually precludes the development of sound national health care strategies to meet the needs of Hispanic American people. The absence of such data becomes critical when making a case for increased health manpower, and accessible health care systems in the Hispanic communities. There is no systematic way of illustrating any correlation between mortality rates, unemployment, underemployment, and the like, and accessible health care delivery and manpower. What information there is, merely indicates that health manpower vocations -- both professional and allied health occupations -- have only a small percentage of Hispanic Americans. The 1970 Census was able to identify the following information on the percentage of Hispanic Americans in the health manpower field:

.7 percent health service workers

1.4 percent dentists

2.1 percent registered nurses

3.6 percent physicians

3.4 percent health technicians

Unfortunately, no breakdown by subgroups (Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central American) is available. A comparative data on Black professionals is available, showing the following:

21.9 percent health service workers

2.3 percent dentists

7.5 percent registered nurses

2.2 percent physicians

10.2 percent health technicians

Considerable data is available on medical schools. During 1972-73, there were 114 medical schools. Of the 47,259 students enrolled, 8 percent or 3,918 were minority students including:

2,585 Blacks

718 Mexican Americans

90 Puerto Ricans

69 American Indians

21 Latin Americans

17 Filipinos

To what extent this manpower development meets the health needs and vocational aspirations of the above minorities, has yet to be discerned. Nor has it yet been determined to what extent non-minority health manpower effectively services minority health

needs. Lastly, the extent to which the health education and manpower development institutions provide for "equal opportunities" is only one of many issues that can and must be effectively addressed in the context of improved data on health needs of Hispanic Americans.

The pattern of information gaps pervades nearly all of the public health and mental health services, with the exception of agency employment, "affirmative action" data within the agencies. Analyses of federal health and mental health agencies may well reveal increased affirmative action efforts towards employment, but such analyses also reveal no discernable changes in the policies of these agencies towards serving the Hispanic American constituencies and communities.

In a small study or the Spanish speaking aged conducted by the National Council of La Raza for the Long Term Care Division of the Health Resources Administration, the absence of any concern for, or conception of the needs of, our elderly by the larger local nursing home institutions was described at length. Similarly noted was the breakdown of basic information structures from the national to the local levels. The most common problems facing Chicano aged were health care and bilingual professional care. Among other recommendations, the report by the National Council of La Raza, entitled, Access to Nursing Home Care for the Spanish Speaking Aged of the Southwest (February, 1974), mentioned as one of the several specific areas needing

extensive basic research, the collection of "accurate demographic and statistical data on cultural and ethnic characteristics pertinent to the design of adequate services for the Spanish speaking elderly."

In its extensive review of research and studies on the Spanish speaking elderly, the National Council of La Raza concluded that the absence of vital statistics was a major cause of federal policy failure to relate to the needs of Hispanic Americans. Responsibility for the inefficiency of such federal agencies rests on the National Center for Health Statistics, and the dozens of other health and health-related information systems agencies in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Neither the improvement of Census data collection, nor of unemployment data, will do much to help begin to understand the needs of our aged, or the health needs of Hispanic Americans in general.

Health data on Hispanic Americans is as important as other data, yet there is no Federal policy that insures the development and the access to such data. This is no less the case with regard to the whole social statistics enterprise in the Social and Rehabilitation Service and the Social Security Administration. As a consequence, there is presently no policy towards advancing the health of Hispanic Americans and their communities. A parallel condition exists with respect to the nations 'social' policy.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR SOCIAL STATISTICS

$215.2 billion was spent on public welfare in fiscal year 1973. This would amount to approximately $1,000 per person in America if it were divided among every man, woman, and child in the U.S. In 1972 it was $900. An additional $80 billion existed in 1973 in the form of private social welfare spending. In the January, 1974, issue of the Social Security Bulletin, Alfred M. Skolnik and Sophie R. Dales of the Office of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Administration, note in their article on "Social Welfare Expenditures, 1972-73," that "the amounts spent for social welfare purposes in 1973 equaled 17.6 percent of the Nation's output of goods and services." Half of the Federal budget now goes to social welfare payments.

A relatively small proportion of the above is in the form of "public assistance support" or what is usually referred to as "welfare." Some 15 million persons receive public assistance during the month. This includes old age assistance, aid to the blind, the disabled, and poor families with dependent children. The amount of assistance involves some $1 billion monthly. In addition, over $800 million dollars are expended monthly on medical assistance payments. (See Public Assistance Statistics - November, 1973, National Center of Social Statistics, March 27, 1974).

Although considerable controversy continues to surround both public assistance and medical assistance programs, particularly with regard to the minority issue, there is no doubt that all

involved in the debate over welfare reform, health insurance, negative income tax, and social security benefits, lack useful and accurate data in many areas. This is no less the case with regard to Hispanic Americans who with an estimated 10 to 15 million population can but have a massive impact on the nation's social security and welfare system.

It is ironic that in the major battles surrounding welfare and health care reforms, little if any thought has been given to the actual status of this nation's second largest racial minority group. Policies have evolved which are based on an assumption that all who need help are being helped. However, if one were to press the Social Security Administration (SSA)-or the Social and Rehabilitation Service (SRS)-to provide proof for such an assumption, it could not do so at this time.

There is a relatively simple cause for this void in the public "dialogue" over policies on welfare, for the social assistance agencies responsible for providing accurate information and data in their areas of authority, have failed to do so. There is virtually no public welfare data on the Hispanic population in the United States. Consequently, any policies geared to "helping all the people" are in fact based on opinions and prejudgments with respect to the Hispanic Americans which can be neither disproved nor verified through the available welfare data information of SRS and SSA.

There is no way of measuring what these agencies are doing to, or for, Hispanic American groups, nor how these agencies are dealing with their needs. There is no way of measuring the impact of welfare policies on Hispanic Americans. Indeed, that ethnic population has no way of making a case for or against any welfare policies past, present or future. It is quite possible that welfare policies, as currently defined, provide no solutions to this dilemma, and that these current policies are wholly destructive in terms of the family structure of Hispanic Americans.

The information gap is not an impossible barrier to the formulation of several welfare policies, but it is doubtful that such policies will be considered based on a limited statistical sample, or on interpretive studies and research undertaken by social scientists. Differential beneficiary data, encompassing the various Hispanic American subgroups in the Social Security Administration's data system, as well as DHEW's social data systems would go a long way toward providing the public with a better understanding of the real needs of this country.

Technically, this task is a feasible one, as revealed by various studies undertaken by the National Center for Social Statistics. The Findings of the 1971 AFDC Study (1971), Findings of the 1970 APTD Study (1972), Findings of the 1970 OAA Study (1972), and Findings of the 1970 AB/Study (1972), contain data on the Hispanic subgroups. Unfortunately, data utilization does not go beyond recipient data by Hispanic "birth or ancestry."

Other factors such as the detailed general demographic characteristics -- e.g. age, sex, marital status, residence, education completed, occupation, etc. -- have not been broken down. The same exists with regard to program information, health and mobility status, services provided, assistance status, living arrangements, household, and dependents.

While considerable data is accessible or already available on Black and White Americans, such is not the case with the Hispanic American. Whether the latter is included in the Black or White statistical category is not clear. Although due note is made of the fact that seven percent of the APTD recipients are known to be of Hispanic American birth or ancestry. However, many states have a higher percentage of Hispanic recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled than the U.S. average for Hispanic Americans (20.1 in Colorado; 17.5 in Texas; 13.9 in New Mexico; 10.1 in Wyoming; 8.6 in Utah; and 8.4 in California). These statistics would be more meaningful if the appropriate supplementary data was available, and would allow for a re-evaluation of policy and administrative effectiveness of federal, state and local public agencies.

For Hispanics, it is doubtful that improvements in unemployment data and the census will be able to sufficiently incorporate the vital social statistics that have an immediate bearing on public assistance policy and employment needs. BLS and Census data will be meaningful only when there is other social data allowing for comparative analysis of needs and the correlation of such data and information.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS

Although a few improvements have been made over the past years on information systems within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare bearing on manpower and education, the gap is still enormous. On the whole, agencies in the Office of Education continue to develop and evaluate policies based on "black-white" social identifier criteria.

Additionally, the failures of our public and private schools to advance accurate information about our school systems delivery of services compound the ability to adequately develop factual policies which take into account the role of Hispanic Americans in our society.

The above mentioned condition is readily evidenced by the lack of attention given to the research and studies of Dr. George D. Mayeske, et. a., of the U.S. Office of Education in A Study of the Achievement of our Nation's Students (1973); A Study of Our Nation's Schools (1972); and A Study of the Attitude Towards Life of Our Nation's Students (1973). These intramural studies, published by the Office of Education as follow-up reports on the Coleman Report, are among the very few in-depth studies containing information on the Spanish speaking and on Chicanos and Puerto Ricans spec ifically. There is no indication that government has used these reports in a positive fashion.

The National Council of La Raza, had the opportunity to both monitor and work with the Office of Education's National Advisory Committee on the Education of Bilingual Children. The total lack of accessibility to pertinent statistical information was of real concern to this Committee, which was mandated by law to advise the Commissioner of Education on policies towards children of limited English-speaking ability.

In its First Annual Report of March 25, 1974, the Advisory Committee noted that it is "an almost impossible task to advise on education policy at this time" because it lacked "pertinent detailed information."

Among the vital statistics the Advisory Committee did not have available was an estimate of the number of children with bilingual needs, and the number of such children at school district levels. It was for that reason that the Committee suggested extensive coordination of research and planning efforts of Federal education agencies, including the active involvement of the National Center for Educational Statistics and Division of Civil Rights. It specifically recommended the "design of a research instrument by the Bureau of Census to identify all school district areas with concentrations of limited and non-English speaking ethnic national origin groups in need of Bilingual Education."

A similar problem was faced by the Federal Interagency Committee on Education. Its April 1973 Task Force Report on Higher Education and the Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and American

Indians "found education statistics for these groups to be sparse." It also noted that "formal evaluations of many existing programs are lacking, and it is difficult to judge the overall impact of these government efforts." Of its six recommendations, one deals with "Data Needs." It called on the Office of Management and Budget to "include in its Annual Special Analysis, a separate analysis of the impact of all Federal educational programs on disadvantaged minorities." In order to accomplish this task adequately, it further recommended that the Office of Management and Budget: "(1) coordinate development of common definitions for racial and ethnic groups; (2) instruct the Federal agencies to collect racial and ethnic enrollment and other educational data on a compatible and non-duplicative basis."

The Interagency Committee cited that "more accurate and uniformly reported data are needed to aid Federal agencies in programs with Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians; efforts to date have been handicapped by the lack of specific information with common categories and definitions to assist federal agencies to better identify the needs of these groups. It would seem more important to have a firm basis for spending federal monies for these programs." (see pg. 6 of Task Force Report).

There is good reason to be concerned. Responsible elements of society want to know how and if Office of Education funds are making a positive contribution to quality education and to determine if State and local policies are doing the same. The

very limited data on Hispanic Americans makes the development and assessment of education policies "guess work," speculation, or worse.

In view of the increased research activity by the National Center for Education Statistics and the apparent higher role assigned to the Center in the Office of Education Fiscal Year 1975 budget, it is clear that the Center can assume an increased information gathering role, systematically encompassing differential data on the various racial-ethnic groups. Until this takes place, the reliability of many if not most of the products of the Office of Education in general, and the National Center for Educational Statistics in particular, will be suspect on scientific grounds. An example of this is the 1972 edition of Projections of Educational Statistics to 1971-82, by Kenneth A. Simon, Chief of the References, Estimates and Projections Branch, and Martin M. Frankel of the Division of Statistical Information and Studies, published by the Center during 1973, which contains no racial-ethnic breakdown and no projections on Hispanic Americans.

There is no indication that the ten-year Higher Education Projections takes account of differential projections relative to minorities. Yet, the Center's report notes that "experience indicates that the final grand enrollment figure for 1972 will be within 2 percent of these preliminary figures." (see p. iv.) One could surmise that those projections recognize or accept the fact that OE policies will not dramatically improve minority groups'

access to educational opportunities, for no change beyond a 2 percent fluctuation is anticipated.

The report provides for no racial-ethnic data on enrollment of high school and higher education graduates and earned degrees; teachers; expenditures by educational institutions; or student charges at institutions of education. Such information would make it possible to estimate with greater accuracy the kind of needs to be met on all levels of government and the private sector.

A simple analysis of the age factor of Chicanos and Puerto Ricans which is fully 10 years below the national median age, according to Census data, would reveal the desirability of differential projections. The growth trend projections for that population sector are fundamentally different from those of the general population, including whites and blacks. Utilization of the undifferentiated statistics as a basis for education and fiscal policy-formulation by the Office of Education would lead to grossly inadequate responses to the pressures facing our nation's school systems, and more particularly to Hispanic minority constituency needs.

Changing the information systems of the Office of Education does not appear to be a difficult task, as indicated, by the Center's 1973 reports on Statistics of Non-public Elementary and Secondary Schools: 1970-71, by Diane B. Gertler and Linda A. Barker; and Adult Basic Education Program Statistics: 1970-71, by Nicholas A. Osso. All three reports

contain data collected on minority group enrollments. Although data on Hispanic Americans is available, minimal utilization for report and study purposes is indicative of low agency priority given to assessing needs of the Hispanic American population. As is the case with the Projections of Educational Statistics report, the accessible differential data on the various minorities is not made use of in policy-related statistical information, e.g. pupil costs and expenditures, health services provided, food services, average daily membership in classes, attendance, age levels breakdown by grades 1 through 12, and the like.

The Office of Education, and the National Center for Educational Statistics having the capability and professional talent to undertake significant research and data gathering activities pertaining to the various Hispanic American groups. The publication by William Dorfman, Projects, Products and Services of the National Center for Educational Statistics 1973 shows that the Center undertakes large numbers of surveys and other data gathering projects. Yet, its past record does not reveal one simple study devoted to assessing the state of the art vis-a-vis Hispanic American minorities. Thus, some of its most "innovative" projects, including the National Assessment of Educational Progress; Longitudinal Study of Educational Effects; Educational Indicators that Measure Social and Program Progress; and School Staffing Patterns, will

not systematically incorporate the concerns of these minorities. This condition is quite serious in view of the Center's self-acknowledged importance in policy-formulation, including: "longitudinal analysis of trends in program expenditures and participation," "evaluation of the targeting of program funds." "recommendations on reallocation of funds for new program activities," "develop and review the Office of Education's budget requests and to support the budget requests before Congress," and other functions. (See pp. 88-89 of Projects, Products and Services.)

Indeed, the technological capabilities of OE in general, and NCES in particular, go far beyond the mere systematic inclusion principle for Hispanic Americans. The Center is already developing a "conversion system for defining school districts in terms of Census Bureau geographical areas," extracting socio-economic data from Census summary tapes. The School Resources and Community Characteristics Project apparently will include the obtaining of data on Hispanic American subgroups. Whether this data will be used in all other appropriate research areas, such as the Projections report, for example, is not clear at this time. Nor is it clear whether, or to what extent, that data will be readily accessible.

The National Center for Educational Statistics plays a vital role in determining the future growth policies within the education complex, an information and planning role which in terms of immediacy, has probably a greater quantitative impact

on Hispanic Americans (50 percent of the latter population, or more than 5 million are children and youths), than the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Agriculture, or the Census Bureau.

Thus, improved NCES data can provide for the development of solutions to problems revealed in BLS unemployment data. BLS data shows, in part, the effects of inadequate education policies, rather than the causes. As with other federal agencies, the issue of systematic inclusion of Hispanic Americans in the Office of Education's information systems is not a lack of technological capability, but the absence of a policy to make systematic use of that capability.

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

This report has largely steered away from the growing debate surrounding the census, labor statistics and agricultural data as it regards the Hispanic American. Rather its thrust has been on the root problems relating to Federal information policy which reflects all of these debates. The NCLR report, Impact of Limited Federal Statistical Data/Information Policies on Hispanic Americans, is intended to aid in defining the problem of informations systems as they pertain to Hispanic Americans. Its goals throughout have been:

- o To bring about an increased awareness on the extent of the problem;
- o To provide a better understanding of its implications on the future economic, social and cultural development of Hispanic Americans.

There is great value in going beyond the confines of the undercount debate which pervades the current labor, census and farm household data. For such a debate fundamentally is one which deals with the technicalities of the Hispanic American dilemma rather than the policies behind them.

The policies behind the technicalities are of enormous import to minorities. Among the invidious outcomes of existing national policies is that they are structuring systems into essentially biracial schemas in which Hispanic Americans become systematically precluded or excluded from the benefits derived from such structured systems.

Although officially and statistically included within the population defined as white, the guarantees for a systematic access to the same opportunities provided for the members of that population

classification are not provided for the Hispanic American within that same classification framework. Officially and statistically, Hispanos exist in one classification. Yet, officially, they also are identified with another classification -- a minority. Within this latter classification, they do not exist statistically. Concurrently, within the white classification, they are not identified. In neither instance is there an identification of needs and interests based on a statistical framework. In both cases, the Hispanic Americans are placed in a competitive situation without that kind of leverage which exists for the predominant white and black sectors! The system is artificially structured against equality in competition. The issue of equal opportunities becomes, in effect, a competition of human need vs. human need, rather than an issue of equal rights for all minorities.

The problem is systematically defined as one of unequal competition in which Hispanic Americans do not have the built-in advantages of blacks and whites.

The problem facing minorities should not be a matter of competition for equality among minorities; rather, at the minimum, it should be systematically structured toward an equality in competition with the economically and socially advantaged sectors of society. In the terms of laws and rights, however, the issue should not at all be structured on a basis of competition among ethnic and racial groups. Policies should be based on human needs and rights of <u>all</u> people and their communities.

Sound management breaks down within the above context. Policies formulated within a system of management that do not identify major interests based on sound information are preferential policies for the included groups whose interests are defined. By definition, Hispanic Americans tend to be least represented among those interests included in the information systems used for policy formulation. An analysis of social indicators, management performance systems, and productivity measurements concepts reveals fundamental flaws in rational public policy making.

These flaws place upon the Hispanic Americans the burden of asserting their rights, interests and needs solely within the pale of pressure politics and political favoritism. Such assertion runs headlong into conflict with management, the other interest groups that are identified within the information systems, the strategies and already established priorities.

The reason for the prevalent non-priority assigned by management and policy makers to the Hispanic American in domestic policies is itself the logical consequence of the low-quality information systems of our government. The current strategic exclusion of the Hispanic American from domestic policies inherently becomes a consequence of value judgments by managers and policy makers, rather than a consequence of management judgment.

Far from eliminating management problems, the present policy structures are geared to create problems as a result of the lack of identification of interests based on sound statistical information, as

well as prevent solutions to basic social and economic needs of millions of people who happen to be Hispanic Americans, and of thousands of barrios and Hispanic American neighborhoods throughout the nation. The prevention of such solutions negatively affects the well-being of non-Hispanics in these areas, as well as the community-at-large.

Throughout this report the desirability and value of an explicitly enunciated national policy for high quality management and high quality management information systems has been suggested. Such a policy is in the interest of all minority groups, and especially, of the disproportionate number of poor and lower income sectors of this nation's communities.

The basis of the critique of federal management information systems is that the latter are not high quality, and, that the lack of quality is a reflection of current national policies' inadequacies. Although there may be various causes of these inadequacies, a major contributing factor is the inefficiency of racial/ethnic data policies of the Federal government. The major illustration of this inefficiency is found in the data information policies of agencies in relation to the Hispanic Americans.

An analysis of those policies reveals that a management information systems (MIS) approach by the Federal government toward the Hispanic American does not exist. From this, it follows that Federal policies toward the Hispanic American are based on considerations other than rational decision-making. The only alternative to rational

decision-making is decision-making based on feelings and attitudes, value judgments and the like. The logical product is inefficiency and ineffectiveness in management.

A pragmatic response to this condition entails the systematic improvement in racial/ethnic data. This requires a policy for systematic improvement of racial/ethnic data gathering and dissemination.

Three key questions have been raised concerning the existing policies of the nation's information systems:

1. Can the social and economic interests of Hispanic Americans be incorporated in the National Interest as defined by fundamental rights and laws relating to racial/ethnic groups?
2. Can the social and economic interests of Hispanic Americans be defined in a forthright and responsible manner in accord with the democratic processes of this nation?
3. Can the dominant force in social and economic policy-making be based on sound information on Hispanic American groups which appropriately identifies needs and interests for the managers and planners of this nation?

The critique basically revolves around these three questions which essentially deal with the question of constitutional rights, reliance on the democratic process and insistance on sound management.

The picture that evolves out of an assessment of current policies is one in which all three questions are answered negatively within the public sector. That picture would lead one to believe that "equal protection under law" does not apply to Hispanic Americans in the technologically advanced society. The position of the National Council of La Raza is that equality is both a possibility and a necessity -- from the technical and practical perspective, as well as the legal perspective.

Management of a healthy democratic society is based on a dialogue of give and take, based on sound and extensive information about all the participants in the dialogue. While not geared to perfection, such a democracy and its managers do not create policies which insure that no dialogue can take place. They do not create policies which result in placing minorities at a disadvantage in helping to advance themselves, their interests, and their participation in the processes of a more efficiently managed society.

In a technologically advanced society, many of the dialogues take place within the 'management information system," or as a result of the 'hard data' acquired through such a system, rather than in a public forum. The absence of the Hispanic American from that type of systems dialogue can and does place unnecessary disadvantages on Hispanic Americans in this nation's public affairs. The disadvantages resulting from the information systems policies, patterns and practices cannot be construed as being in the national interest or in keeping with constitutional rights, the democratic processes and sound management, which are the goals and guidelines of those interest groups who are part of the American tradition!

* * * * * * * * *